BX
1751
C66

UCSB

The Catholic Church and Modern Christianity

BY

REV. BERNARD J. OTTEN, S.J.
Professor of Philosophy in St. Louis University

SECOND EDITION

St. Louis, Mo.:
Published by B. HERDER,
17 S. Broadway.

Freiburg, (Baden):
B. HERDER.

London and Edinburgh:
SANDS & CO.

Nihil obstat.

Die 2. Jan. 1907. H. Moeller, S. J.
Praep. Prov. Missour.

Nihil obstat.

S. Ludovici, die 12 Jan. 1907. F. G. Holweck,
Censor theol.

Imprimatur.

S. Ludovici, die 14. Jan. 1907. † Joannes J. Glennon,
Archiepiscopus Sti. Ludovici.

Copyright, 1907, by Joseph Gummersbach.

CONTENTS

PART FIRST

CHAPTERS		PAGE
I.	Naturalism the Blight of the Age.	9
II.	Doctrinal Development — Is there Progress in Religion?	27
III.	Faith and Science.	47

PART SECOND

I.	Origin and Effects of Religious Prejudice.	67
II.	The Ancient Church and Modern Freethought.	83
III.	Toleration and Intolerance.	100
IV.	The Catholic Church and the Bible.	121
V.	Mary's Place in the Church of Christ.	143
VI.	The Catholic Church and Education.	163

PREFACE.

In the following pages an attempt is made to place in its true light the present position of the Catholic Church in reference to the various other religious denominations. This attempt was suggested by the striking fact, that, even in this age of universal toleration, the Christian world is still divided into two hostile camps, between which there seems to be an irreconcilable opposition. On the one side stands arrayed in solitary grandeur the old historic Church, that has come down to us across the ages unchanged, even as the name which she bears; whilst on the other are gathered the various Churches which have sprung up in more recent times, and are classed under the generic term of Protestantism:— Churches that are indeed at variance among themselves as regards important points of doctrine, yet rally around a common standard in their opposition to Catholic views and practices. This opposition needs explanation,

for it shows that there is a serious misunderstanding on the part of our non-Catholic brethren, whereby they are led to an almost constant violation of that charity which should distinguish all the followers of Christ. Hence the main object of this little treatise is to point out the reasonableness of the Catholic position, and thus to promote the union of love, which in its turn may lead to unity of faith.

The booklet comprises two parts: — the first part deals with the naturalizing tendency which is so strong and so universal in the religious world to-day, and against which the Catholic Church takes a most determined stand; whilst the second part treats of the more important charges which Protestants are wont to urge against the Catholic Church, and in which the aforesaid opposition finds its outward expression.

In reference to these charges it may be well to state, that it is not the writer's direct intention to prove that Protestants are in the wrong, but rather to make it evident that Catholics are in the right. This may seem to be a distinction without a difference; yet a difference there is, and one that offers a decided advantage, in as much as it eliminates the necessity

of saying anything that might give offense to our separated brethren. Hence the treatment of the various points is explanatory rather than controversial, although, owing to the nature of the different subjects, controversy could not be entirely avoided.

The writer believes that Protestant opposition to Catholic views and practices is largely due to deep-rooted religious prejudice, and therefore the introductory discussion of the second part deals with that topic. Following this, the more important points at issue between Protestants and Catholics are briefly discussed, both in their historical and doctrinal aspect. As far as the nature of the subject permitted, all intricate reasoning has been avoided, so that the general reader will find the various discussions well within his reach.

PART FIRST.

I.

NATURALISM THE BLIGHT OF THE AGE.

The age we live in is frequently styled the Age of Progress. And such it is in many respects. Whether we stay at home or go abroad, retire to the quiet of the country or mingle with the rush and roar of our city thoroughfares, everywhere and at all times do we come face to face with the spirit of progress, manifesting itself in a thousand different forms. There is progress in the arts and sciences; progress in mechanical devices and industrial methods; progress in all that makes life more enjoyable and work more lucrative;—the spirit of progress hovers over land and sea, everywhere calling into action man's latent powers, and scattering broadcast its blessings of wealth and comfort and ease.

Nor is this spirit to be condemned as wholly evil. It may indeed rush to fatal extremes; it may be misdirected; it may proceed from wrong motives; yet in itself it is in conformity with man's nature, and may be the source of much good. When God appointed man to "fill the earth and subdue it," He formulated a law according to which man must ever tend to the more perfect. This law is at the root of all true progress, and steadily urges on the race to new exertions in every line of development. Where one generation leaves off the work of improvement, there the succeeding one takes it up, but only to hand it over in a more advanced condition to its successor. And so progress marches on, and ever will march on, through the ages, until the last page of history shall have been written, and time shall glide into eternity.

Yet, whilst we thus look with a certain well founded pride upon our age, there are not wanting grave causes of alarm. Where there are strong lights, there also are found deep shadows. Absorbing devotion to material interests must of its very nature interfere with the attention due to our spiritual

requirements. As our divine Saviour so pointedly put it: "No one can serve two masters — God and mammon. For either he will hate the one and love the other: or he will sustain the one and despise the other." (Matt. vi, 24). He may indeed attend to both; but serve both, he cannot. As matters stand, the interests of mammon are opposed to the interests of God; the material contravenes the spiritual, and therefore they cannot be co-ordinated. Any attempt at a divided service spells failure, and invariably ends in the subordination of the spiritual to the material; in the victory of mammon over God.

Hence we find that the phenomenal progress along material lines, in which the minds and hearts of men are so completely absorbed at present, is accompanied by a retrograde movement in religious aspirations. Men still claim to be religious; but for the most part they appreciate only a religion of their own making. The divine element of Christianity is made to yield its place to the human; the will of God is overshadowed by the will of man, and supernatural religion is gradually supplanted by one that is wholly natural in

character. Blinded by material prosperity; intoxicated with the achievements of science; wholly wrapt up in the things of earth, men are fast losing all sense of the supernatural: because, as the Apostle says, "the sensual man perceiveth not these things that are of the spirit of God: for it is foolishness to him and he cannot understand." (I Cor. ii, 14).

It is this inability to rise above the world of the senses, resulting for the most part from an unrestrained devotion to temporal interests, that forms the well-spring of naturalism in religion to-day. Little by little men are persuading themselves, if not in theory, at least in practice, that "this world is man's ultimate end; that beyond this earth there is no hope for him in the land that lies beyond the shadows of the valley of death, and that therefore he may cling to idolatries of clay, and linger as long as he can near cool fountains in the sensuous shade, and when these cloy, end all with the bodkin's edge." This is naturalism in its final stage of development, and as such, let us hope, it is not yet so common among men who still glory in the sacred name of Christian; but besides this extreme phase, there is a vast variety of lighter shades, all

constantly deepening into that abysmal gloom, where finally sight is lost of man's glorious destiny in the house of God his Father:— into that gloom where no virtue can blossom and ripen into golden fruitage, except such as belong entirely to the natural order; where faith can strike no root; where hope can find no anchorage, and where divine charity is smothered in the fetid atmosphere of sensuous indulgence. This last phase of naturalism we are gradually approaching, and when we shall have reached it, there will fall upon the world a blight such as it has not known since the darkness of Paganism fled before the dawn of the first Christian Easter Morning.

That this naturalizing tendency is subsersive of the most fundamental teaching of Christianity is manifest from the very nature of the case. For if Christianity stands for anything, and is not a mere name, a shadow without a substance, it stands for a religion that is in its essence and aims purely supernatural. It proposes to its adherents an end that lies beyond the reach of their natural powers; it offers for the attainment of that end means which nature cannot provide, and it requires the practice of virtues for which man,

left to himself, has no aptitude. Hence whoso would introduce a natural religion, were it ever so sublime, must *ipso facto* reject Christianity, and may no longer call himself a Christian.

If you will, there is a natural element in Christianity, even as there was a human nature in Christ; but this is pervaded by the supernatural spirit within, and depends upon the same for all that gives it grace of form and beauty of feature. Christianity is indeed in the world, but it is not of the world, even as Christ's kingdom also was not of the world. It was meant to regenerate society; to change the earth, once accursed of its Maker, into a paradise of delight; yet to accomplish this, its Divine Founder gave it no other means than those which He Himself made use of, when He came down from heaven to save that which was lost. "As the Father hath sent me," he said to His Apostles, "I also send you. (John xx, 20). Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark. xvi, 15, 16). The Saviour's mission was not to promote the cultivation of

the arts and sciences; to suggest new industries; to open up avenues to wealth and luxury; to establish philanthropic associations and social clubs; but to show men the way to heaven by teaching them how to lead lives of faith and hope and charity. The keynote of all His teachings was: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things," that is, whatever is needful for your bodily well-being, "shall be added unto you." (Matt. vi, 33). He did not discourage thrift and industry; He did not put a ban upon the cultivation of the arts and sciences; He did not condemn reasonable social enjoyments: but He made it clearly understood, that all these things must be subordinated to the service of God and the salvation of the soul. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, . . . What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but suffer the loss of his immortal soul?" (Matt. xvi, 26).

With this object in view, He established, not a commonwealth for which He enacted wise laws, but a Church to which He gave authority to teach supernatural truths, and to administer the sacraments unto the sanctification of all for whom He poured out His heart's

best blood. Upon that Church He conferred His own divine authority, for He said: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me." To it He conceded His own powers as Saviour of mankind, saying: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." (John xx, 22, 23). In it He would abide forever, not only as a sure guide to truth, but as a perennial source of sanctification, as He clearly indicated when He said: "Little children, I will not leave you orphans." "Come to me all ye that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you." "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath life everlasting, and I will raise him up on the last day." (John vi, 57).

Hence the believing Christian, according to Christ's clearly expressed intention, lives in a divine atmosphere from his birth even till his death. Scarcely has the child of Christian parents been ushered into existence, when its infant soul is regenerated by the cleansing laver of Baptism in a second and spiritual birth, whereby it is sealed with the ineffaceable character of Christian, to become, as the Fath-

ers of the early Church were wont to express it, another Christ. A few years of unconscious existence glide swiftly by, and then reason unfolds its wondrous powers. Yet before the mind reaches out in conscious thought to the surrounding world, its eyes have been opened through a mother's influence to the light of God's love, even as the eyes of the body rest in childish admiration upon the splendors of the earthly sun. In virtue of this influence, the child learns without effort to fold his hands in prayer, and with pure and innocent lips he lisps the sweet names of Jesus and Mary. As day follows day, consciousness fully awakens, and then life's struggles begin; for the perils of the world encompass every man's path through life. But lo, Christ has made provision against these dangers. Through the sacrament of Confirmation He bestows the Unction of the Holy Spirit, thereby rendering the soul strong and brave in the broad arena of Christian warfare. In that warfare there is many a sharp encounter, many a fierce conflict; for " the wrestling is not alone against flesh and blood; but against principalities, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirit of wickedness in

high places." Yet if unhappily the Christian warrior succumbs, his God awaits him in the tribunal of mercy, in the sacrament of Penace, where consecrated ministers, not only by powers divine heal the unsightly wounds inflicted by sin, but also infuse into the soul fresh courage for future combats. Nay, the same God invites him to a heavenly banquet, where the God-Man Christ becomes the very food of his soul, and thus endues him with his own strength and endurance. Thus is he constantly upheld by a power from on high, until his course be run; and then at the last moment, when kindred and friends stand helpless at his side, the same loving Providence enfolds him in its protecting arms, anointing his body with the Oil of the Infirm, refreshing his soul with the Viaticum of Christ's Body and Blood, and thus comforted and strengthened and shielded from harm, leads him into the presence of his Maker.

Hence from the cradle to the grave, the true Christian necessarily leads a supernatural life, being ever in vital union with Christ, even as the branches that bear the empurpled grape are in vital union with the vine, whence they draw their life-giving sap. If, therefore, we

study the Christian religion as it was established by Christ, we are forced to say that it is purely supernatural in character.

Furthermore, if we cast but a cursory glance at the origin and rapid spread of Christianity, we shall find that it was precisely the emphasis which Christ placed upon the supernatural that made the world Christian. He proposed Himself to young and old as a model, an ideal, compelling by His strong and sublime personality both their love and imitation; yet He always remained on a supernatural plane, lifting up earth to heaven rather than bringing down heaven to earth. "Be ye holy as I am holy," was the battle cry that went forth from the obscure country of Judea, and gathered around the Standard of the Cross the sons and daughters of all nations. From the moment that his creative spirit, all radiant with the light of heaven, moved over the polluted waters of pagan corruption, there sprang up on all sides those rare flowers of Christian holiness which shine like gems upon every page of modern history; and it was because of the same spirit, working with divine efficacy in the hearts of countless men and women, that Christian society rose from its very beginning

so far superior to that of the ancient world. Thus "the purest among the strong, and the strongest among the pure, Christ lifted with His wounded hands empires from their hinges, and changed the course of the stream of ages."

It has been very aptly said, that Christ remade the world to His own image and likeness, and so regenerated it. As an ideal at once human and divine, He entered into the very hearts and souls of men, and created in them an all pervading desire to rise above the things of sense, and to make their lives godlike. Scarcely had He risen in triumph from the grave, when love awoke upon His empty tomb, and inspired whole nations to put into practice His sublime teaching, which fell like refreshing dew upon the arid wastes of pagan selfishness. The Spirit of God went forth and renewed the face of the earth. Men, who of the earth had become earthly, lifted up their eyes to heaven, and beheld in glorious vision the City of Peace, which was to be their home, if they would but dare to fight the good fight and stretch forth their hand to the eternal crown of justice. Firmly established in the conscious possession of truth, through the

teaching of Christ's infallible Church, they gathered strength from their Saviour's consoling words: Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all else shall be added unto you; and in that strength they found courage to follow the footsteps of Him whose earthly career ended upon the cross.

Then sprang into existence the Christian home, modeled upon the little home at Nazareth, where Christ Himself was the guardian spirit of the hearthstone. From that home went forth men and women all radiant with the light of godlike purity and possessed of hearts that pulsated with a love of God and neighbor all but divine. Thus the Gospel of peace brought sunshine into a world that had for ages been encompassed by the shadows of death. Churches and schools and charitable institutions arose everywhere as so many manifestations of the spirit of Christ, slowly regenerating the world by fashioning it into His own image and likeness. Human nature, indeed, remained what it had ever been, weak, inconstant, fickle, inclined to evil; but from the Church, which Christ had built upon the mountain top, there flowed without ceasing a sevenfold stream of grace, which lifted men

and women above the weaknesses of their fallen nature, and enabled them to enjoy the sweets of life, end endure its ills, in such a manner as to perfect in themselves evermore the image of the Godhead.

And as it was in the beginning, so it has been throughout the Christian past, so it is even now wherever the religion of Christ is looked upon, not merely as a beautiful dream, a poetic fiction, but as a practical rule of life, such as the God-Man Himself has ordained it for all times. It is a religion that receives man with the love of a mother at his birth; accompanies him as a guardian spirit along all the devious paths of life, and enables him to look with steady eye into the bright effulgence of eternity at the moment of death. And this is the religion which the naturalizing tendency, so strong and widespread in the modern world, aims at abolishing. Men who of the earth have become earthly, yet glorying still in the name of Christian, dare to lay their desecrating hands upon all that is most holy in the religion established by Christ. The life-giving union, which Christ established between Himself and His followers, they endeavor to dissolve by eliminating from the

lives of men all that bears a supernatural character. They will no longer allow the little ones to come to the Saviour of mankind and receive from Him the blessing of supernatural faith, but by a system of purely secular education start them upon a course of worldly wisdom that limits their aspirations to earthly enjoyments. Prayer they regard as superfluous, and divine worship they set down as an anachronism that should have disappeared with the fancied darkness of the Middle Ages. They degrade the sacramental union, wherein according to Christ's intention man and woman are indissolubly united, to a merely civil contract, which may be broken almost at will, as suggested by caprice or dictated by passion. They worship success as an idol, and point to worldly prosperity as a criterion of virtue. Christ, by emphasizing the divine element of Christianity, made the world Christian; they, by insisting upon what is purely natural, will end by making it pagan. And still these men call themselves Christians, progressive Christians, enlightened followers of Christ. What a byword they make of so sacred a name! They may call themselves Christians, but their Christianity is without Christ; they may style

themselves progressive, but their progress is retrograde, and its final term is paganism.

It is against this paganizing movement that the Catholic Church takes her stand; it is against this misnamed progress that she lifts up her voice. Founded to continue the divine mission of Christ upon earth, it is the very end and object of her existence to preserve and keep alive the supernatural element of Christianity. Rationalists may sneer at her conservatism; the sects may call her narrow-minded; it matters not: to one and all she gives the same answer: "For this was I born, and for this came I into the world, that I should give testimony of the truth; and this is the truth, that the Christian religion is in all its parts supernatural, and therefore not susceptible of modifications devised by human wisdom. What Christ made it in the beginning, that must it remain forever: supernatural in the faith which it exacts of its adherents; supernatural in the end which it proposes as man's destiny; supernatural in the means which it offers for the attainment of that end."

And in this protest the Catholic Church stands practically alone. Her voice is the

voice of one crying in the wilderness. Among the hundreds of so-called Christian Churches, there is not one that does not bend before the storm of modern Rationalism. Beyond the pale of the Catholic Church the religious world is as protean in its aspect as in the ocean's surface, changing its form with every passing breeze. Doctrine after doctrine is modified, changed, abandoned; and in each modification, in every change, the human element encroaches upon the divine; the natural supplants the supernatural, until finally nothing remains but a religion that is entirely of man's making.

You may perhaps be inclined to call this statement harsh, unkind, uncalled for; but it is neither the one nor the other: for truth is truth till the end of reckoning, and in a matter of such vital importance as this necessarily is, the truth must be proclaimed from the housetops. Examine into the conditions of things for yourselves: study the religion established by Christ; investigate the teaching of the Catholic Church, such as it is to-day, and such as it has ever been throughout the centuries that are past; compare the one with the other; place the result of your inquiry in the balance with the variegated innovations

that disfigure all Protestant Churches, and you will be convinced that I am speaking the truth and nothing but the truth.

Protestants may love their religion, and I think well of them because of that love; for wherever the heart clings to religious sentiments, though they be misplaced, there still glimmers a spark of the divine fire which Christ came to enkindle upon earth: they may be convinced of the truth of their religion, and I respect them, if they have the courage of their convictions; for to err is human, and where convictions are sincere, though they rest unconsciously upon a false foundation, there the dignity of human nature remains unimpaired; but this loving devotion and sincere conviction of individuals can do nothing towards redeeming the erroneous religious system whereof such persons are the unfortunate victims. Whatsoever religious institution professes to be the Church of Christ, must hold fast to the faith of Christ; must be the same to-day as it was yesterday; must stand unmoved amid the storms and tempests of the ages; for Christ built His church upon a rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

II.

DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT.

In the preceding discussion I endeavored to make it clear that the naturalizing tendency, so strong and so universal in the religious world to-day, is of its very nature subversive of the religion established by Christ. For the most fundamental teaching of that religion is that man was elevated to a supernatural state, and that therefore man's destiny lies beyond the scope of nature, and can be attained only by the use of means wholly supernatural in character. Consequently, whoso attempts to substitute the practice of merely natural virtue for a life of supernatural faith, breaks completely with the religion of Christ, and returns in effect to the ideals of Paganism. He may still glory in the name of Christian, but he rejects the sublime reality for which that name has ever stood throughout the Christian past.

To this conclusion the modern world objects on the score that in religion no less than

in science, there must be progress and development. As the race advances in scientific knowledge, so also must it advance in the perception and interpretation of religious truths, and bring these truths into ever more perfect accord with scientific discoveries. Hence it may well happen, they say, that truths, which in the first ages of Christianity were believed to lie outside the bounds of nature, are really contained within the same, as understood by the enlightened spirit of modern times. What our forefathers interpreted in a supernatural sense, to that we may now assign a natural meaning, at least when such meaning is more in harmony with prevailing scientific theories. This is a very specious objection, and has wrought untold mischief in the lives of persons who, above all else, wish to be considered enlightened. It will be timely, therefore, to place this theory of doctrinal development in its true light, as we shall endeavor to do in the present discussion

First, then, is there such a thing as doctrinal development, or progress in religion? There undoubtedly is; for the Church of Christ is not something dead or inert, but a living organism, possessed of an internal prin-

ciple of activity. She is, indeed, continuous and indefectible; yet her continuity and indefectibility is not that "of the dead letter of a book, or of a lifeless statue, but a living organic being, animated by the Holy Ghost." Hence Christ Himself compares His Church to "a grain of mustard seed: which when it is sown in the earth, is less than all the seeds that are in the earth: and when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, and shooteth out great branches, so that the birds of the air may dwell under the shadow thereof." (Mark iv, 31, 32). Each succeeding age, as it rolls by, is fraught with new dangers to the faith; every generation of men, as it peoples the earth, has its own peculiar needs, and these Christ provided for by breathing into His Church a living spirit, which of its own innate activity should be capable of meeting the exigencies of every age and satisfying the wants of all generations.

Hence as the Church, according to the intention of her Divine Founder, contains within herself an internal principle of life, she must be capable of development, not only in respect to her devotional practices, but also as regards her doctrinal teaching. Yet that

development must be in the form of growth, as it is in all living organic beings. It cannot imply any essential change, but must of necessity consist in a gradual unfolding of what was possessed from the beginning. This was well expressed by the English Catholic Bishops in their joint Pastoral on "Liberal Catholicism." Their words are: "Not only do the faithful grow in the Faith, but faith itself may be said to grow as a child grows in its own form and character, or as a tree in its own unmistakable properties." The same idea was expressed by St. Vincent of Lerins, fifteen hundred years ago. In his book, entitled Commonitorium, he writes: "It is the property of progress that a thing be developed in itself; it is the property of change that a thing be altered from what it was to something else." And to the question, "Whether there shall be no progress of religion in the Church of Christ," he replies: "Certainly, let there be progress, and as much as may be, but so that there be really progress in the faith, not an alteration of it." (n. 23 and 37).

In this matter, therefore, we must first of all guard against false inferences, which might easily be drawn from the illustrations just

given. In the material world around us, the growth of living organisms depends upon the assimilation of material received from without. Thus a child cannot grow into a man except by assimilating the food which sustains its life; nor can a tender shoot develop into a tree save by transforming into its own substance the elements breathed in from the atmosphere, or absorbed from the soil. It is a growth that is conditioned by the supply of extraneous material. No such assimilation or transformation takes place in doctrinal growth. Whatever doctrine may in course of time be proposed to the explicit belief of the faithful, must in its entirety have been contained in the original Deposit of Faith, as it was bequeathed to the world by Christ through His Apostles. At the death of St. John, who was the last surviving Apostle, that Deposit was complete, and to it nothing shall ever be added, even by way of a new revelation. Private revelations, granted to single individuals, may be vouchsafed from time to time for God's own wise purposes; but not such as bear a public character, and are proposed to the acceptance of the faithful in general.

The truth of this statement, namely, that

to the original Deposit of Faith nothing is to be added in course of time, is quite manifest from our Lord's own teaching. Thus, in the fifteenth chapter of St. John, He says to His Apostles: "All things whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known to you." (John xv, 15). And again: "But the Paraclete, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I shall have said to you." (John xiv, 26). And finally, in the commission which He gave His Apostles to teach all nations, He said: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations; . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Mark, xxviii, 19, 20). The divine message which He had brought down from heaven, He entrusted in its entirety to His Apostles, and that message was to be for all times the sacred Deposit of Faith to which nothing might be added.

Hence, also, we find that the Apostles exhorted the faithful not to look for a new revelation, but to persevere in the faith which

they had received. Thus St. Paul, writing to Timothy, says very pointedly: "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast heard from me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus. Keep the good things committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us." (II Tim. iii). And to the Corinthians he writes: "Other foundation to man can lay, but that which is laid; which is Christ Jesus." (I Cor. iii, 11). Finally, in his Epistle to the Galatians, he goes so far as to say: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which you have received, let him be anathema." (Gal. i, 8).

Moreover, as there can be no addition from without, whereby the Deposit of Faith might be increased, so neither can there be any rejection from within, whereby it might be diminished. In living organisms that belong to the physical order, there is a constant rejection of elements that have served their purpose; but in the living Church, as a system of supernatural religion, such rejection is impossible. What was a revealed truth once, must remain a revealed truth forever; and if it was of use at one time, it must be of use

at all times. Hence Christ commanded His Apostles and their successors to teach all truth to all nations, from His own day even to the consummation of the world.

This same view, both as regards addition to, and subtraction from, the Deposit of Faith, has been held by the Church even from the earliest times, as is clearly indicated in the Epistle of Barnabas, written at the beginning of the second century. The author says: "This is the rule of true enlightenment: Keep what thou hast received, neither adding thereunto, nor taking away anything." So also St. Vincent of Lerins, who wrote towards the middle of the fifth century, puts this point very clearly, when he says: "The Church of Christ, being a vigilant and careful guardian of the doctrines committed to her, makes no change in these at any time, subtracts nothing, adds nothing, does not curtail what is essential, nor tack on what is not needed. She does not let slip what is her own, she does not pilfer what is another's; her whole endeaver, her one aim by her treatment of all questions, at once faithful and wise, is to bring out into clearness what was once vague and incomplete, to strengthen and secure what is already devel-

oped and distinct, to keep watch and ward over doctrines already established and defined." (Com. n. 23).

In this passage the Saint indicates what he conceives, and what history testifies to be the nature and aim of doctrinal development in the Church of Christ. In its last analysis said development is but an authorative declaration and clear definition of revealed truths as demanded by the exigencies of the times; which truths, however, were implicitly contained in what was taught from the beginning. Studying the matter in the light of history, we find the following facts clearly delineated. When the Gospel was first announced to the world, only the more essential truths that stood out prominently were clearly apprehended by converts to the faith; whilst others not so essential, though contained in the Gospel as preached, escaped general notice. As a result, the first class of truths were believed explicitly, that is, their import being understood, they were formally accepted and assented to by the faithful; whilst the second class were believed only implicitly, that is, the faithful accepted on the authority of God's word whatever might be contained in the Gos-

pel message, though they did not as yet have a comprehensive knowledge of what was contained therein. The motive and ground of their belief was God's infallible word, and that word vouched as well for truths that were still hidden from view, as for those others that stood out clearly in the full light of revelation. Thus it naturally happened that at first there appeared but a limited number of doctrines which were evidently of faith, whilst many others needed a fuller and clearer exposition before they could be proposed for explicit and formal acceptance, and in this sense might be said to be not of faith.

This condition of things lasted so long as there was little time or opportunity of studying the Gospel message closely; but as soon as that study began, discussions arose and opinions were formed as to what doctrines were contained in the Gospel, besides those which had been apprehended as evident from the first. Whilst these discussions were going on among the faithful, the highest teaching authority of the Church preserved as it were a neutral attitude, neither condemning the one opinion nor approving the other, simply because there seemed to be no immediate call

for an authoritative statement concerning the matter in question. This may be called the initial stage of doctrinal development. Truths that had till then escaped all notice were, under new extrinsic conditions, adverted to, and by reason of the discussions carried on, slowly assumed definite form in the minds of the faithful, though they were not as yet made perfectly clear by an authoritative decision of the teaching Church.

The next step was taken when the Church herself, in virtue of the teaching office entrusted to her by her Divine Founder, took cognizance of the matter; either tacitly confirming a doctrine by allowing it to be taught by her theologians as being of faith, or else directly removing all doubt by a formal definition, which was given sometimes by a general council presided over by the Pope, and at others it was rendered by the Pope himself, acting in his capacity as supreme teacher of all the faithful. When this approval, either tacit or formal, had once been given, the matter was settled forever. The doctrine which till then, though really revealed by God, had for want of an authoritative statement been doubtful, as far as the faithful were concerned,

was henceforth to be formally accepted and explicitly believed by all.

As a concrete example, we may take the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It was not until 1854, when this doctrine was solemnly defined by Pius IX, that the faithful were obliged to believe explicitly that Mary, the Mother of God, had been preserved from all stain of original sin. The doctrine itself had been revealed by God, yet its revelation was not so evident that it removed all doubt from the minds of those who studied the Gospel message. In the first promise of a Redeemer, which God made to Adam and Eve immediately after their fall, He stated that He would put enmity between the Mother of the Redeemer and satan, (Gen. iii, 15), and as that enmity was not restricted to any particular period of her life, the statement thus made led naturally to the inference that it excluded all sin from her soul. Again, some four thousand years later, at the time of the Incarnation, the angel Gabriel called Mary full of grace, (Luke i, 28), whereby he might well seem to imply fulness of time no less than perfection of holiness, so that Mary had been in possession of divine

grace from the very first moment of her existence. Lastly, the very fact that she was to be the Mother of God seemed to demand absolute freedom from sin at every moment of her life; for how can we imagine that the Son of God would take flesh of a mother who had been a slave of satan? The very idea seems repugnant to reason; because as the honor of the mother is the honor of the child, so also is the disgrace of the mother the disgrace of the child.

All these reasons made it clear that the doctrine in question rested on a solid foundation, and the faithful, almost without exception, gave it their unhesitating assent. Early Christian writers assumed it as certain when treating of Mary's prerogatives; theologians taught it in the schools; particular churches commemorated the implied fact by a special feast, and the Roman Pontiffs even signified their approval in an unofficial way: yet in spite of all this, the doctrine was not a matter of faith, because its revelation was not evident, nor did the teaching Church in all those ages confirm it by an authoritative statement. But when after nineteen hundred years the circumstances of the times made it desirable that a

difinitive declaration should be made, the Sovereign Pontiff took the matter under advisement, conferred with the Bishops and other prelates of the Church, and then in virtue of his supreme teaching office, and guided by the divinely promised assistance of the Holy Spirit, declared and defined, that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, according to which the Blessed Virgin Mary had in the first instant of her conception been preserved from all stain of original sin, had been revealed by God, and was therefore to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful. Thus all possible doubt concerning the doctrine in question was removed; what the faithful had of their own accord accepted and piously believed for ages, was by this definition made a matter of absolute certainty. No new truth was added to the Deposit of Faith; but a truth concerning which there had been some doubt as to whether it was really contained in the Deposit of Faith, was by this solemn definition authoritatively declared to be most certainly contained therein.

In this manner one doctrine has been approved and defined after another; what was at first obscure has been made clear; what for

a long time seemed doubtful has at last been proved to be certain. Thus, in the lapse of ages, the truths to be explicitly believed by the faithful, and consequently their knowledge of the true faith, has grown constantly, not by addition from without, nor by new revelations, but by a gradual unfolding from within, under the unfailing care of the infallible teaching authority which Christ established on earth. It has been a true development, a healthy growth, proceeding from an internal vital principle, which the Divine Author of the Church breathed into her face at the moment of her birth. In all her doctrinal definitions the Church has maintained her individual identity, yet "shooting forth great branches," even as the tree that sprang from the mustard seed, "the smallest indeed of all the seeds in the earth." And as in the past, so will she continue in the future; for she is the work of God, and the work of God endureth forever.

Now, in what does this development, this growth, this progress in religion, differ from that advocated by the so-called enlightened spirits of our age? Precisely in this, that the one is progress, and the other is change. The one is a safeguarding of doctrines always be-

lieved, and the other is a substitution of something new for what has come down to us from the days of old. The constant development and advance of scientific ideas, say these would-be theologians, necessitates a new interpretation of the dogmas hitherto taught by the Church and believed by the faithful: not in the sense merely that a fuller understanding of said dogmas is gradually acquired, but that their very meaning is changed. As an example to illustrate this point, we may take the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ. For eighteen hundred years practically all Christians, to whatever denominations they might belong, were at one in their belief that Christ was, in the true sense of the word, the Son of God, consubstantial with the Father, and equal to him in all things. Nor was this only the belief of the faithful in general, but it was put forward by nearly every Christian Church as a fundamental dogma. But now men in high places come forward with the astounding message, that, forced by the findings of Higher Criticism, we must consider the time-honored belief in the Divinity of Christ as obsolete. A higher perception of the truth involved in the term "Son of God,"

claimed as His own by Christ Himself, and applied to Him by His disciples, makes it plain that He is not the Son of God. Of course, say they, if you are so inclined, you may still use that name when speaking of Christ, but only in the sense in which it is occasionally applied to other good men. In nature and in person Christ is purely human, but because of His virtue and spiritual enlightenment, you may consider Him godlike, and with that understanding call Him the Son of God.

Now, is this progress in religion, or is it not rather a change of the same? Does the religion, which for eighteen hundred years was based upon the explicit belief in the Divinity of Christ, maintain its own identity, when Christ is made out to be a mere man? Is it not the most fundamental change that could be made in any religion? Why, it is an absolute repudiation of Christ and His message, and a substitution for the same of a phanton decked out in the incongruous trappings of Paganism. You may call it progress, if you choose, but it is a progress like that which is observed when death lays his cold hand upon his victim — it ends in the horrors of the tomb.

And here the marvel is, that this modern progress in religion is advocated and pushed forward, not by pronounced infidels, but by men who call themselves Christians, and not rarely occupy high places in their respective denominations. Scarcely a month passes without notice being given by some Protestant Divine, some professor of theology, or preacher of the Word, that he finds himself out of tune with the beliefs of the Christian past. The Reverend Briggs, Carter, Crapsey, and a host of others, have made public declarations of their rejection of Christian dogmas, on the plea that they cannot be brought into harmony with the misnamed scientific views of the age. Such apostles of a new Paganism are also, though much more rarely, found among persons who claim allegiance to the Catholic Church. Men on the stamp of Loisy are almost as un-Christian in their interpretation of the Scriptures as Harnack and his school of modern Rationalism. But whilst among Catholics such men are promptly cut off from the communion of the faithful, among Protestants, in the vast majority of cases, they are allowed to carry on their paganizing propaganda without let or hindrance. And

why not? What authority can Protestant Churches appeal to when their doctors disagree? The Scriptures? Why, the Scriptures in themselves are but a dead letter; they can give utterance only when there breathes through them a quickening spirit, infallible in its decisions as the Spirit of God. They must be interpreted by a living authority, established by Him who commissioned the Apostles and their successors to preach the Gospel to all nations. Yet such an authority Protestants will not admit. For is it not a fundamental principle in every Protestant Church, that in the interpretation of the Scriptures everyone is his own Daniel? A Unitarian has as much right to his views concerning the personality of Christ as the orthodox Lutheran, though these respective views be contradictory. Hence, as St. Peter words it, "They wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction."

In respect to this point, I would ask you to ponder the words of the late Doctor De Costa, a Catholic convert from Anglicanism. What he said concerning the staid and conservative Anglican Church, applies with much greater force to every other Protestant denomination.

After handing in to Bishop Potter his resignation as an Episcopal clergyman, he said: "The Bible, so far as Episcopalians are concerned, has met its Sedan. This diocese and the Episcopal Church at large is dominated by what the ruling factions call 'the spirit of the age.' They forget to say 'what' age. This 'spirit' that they talk about is simply the belated ghost of the age of Arianism. It recalls the words of one who spoke of the Georgian as a period when things were shelving down into a well-written, able, moral, gentlemanly deism."

"The Episcopal Church has made a new departure, and I cannot go along with it. Consistency requires a repudiation of the whole scheme, and I think I have adopted the best method. I prefer the faith I learned at my mother's knee to the inventions of sciolists. If any of my old friends are grieved I shall feel sorry."

III.

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

The naturalizing tendency, so strong and so universal in the religious world to-day, results necessarily, in a false religious progress. It is a false progress, because in its last analysis it means a radical change of the religion established by Christ. For that religion is essentially supernatural, and a transition from the supernatural to the natural can be effected only by a change of religious principles. In this change many of the outward manifestations of the spirit of Christ remain; they still brighten the world even as the ruddy glow of an autumn sunset; but the spirit itself, that rose like a star of Jacob, is fast disappearing from the face of the earth. The promoters of this false progress still call themselves Christians, but their Christianity is without Christ; it is a name without a reality, a shadow without a substance.

That this naturalizing tendency finds so many advocates in modern times is owing to a variety of causes; yet the one most frequently assigned, at least by those who fall back upon intellectual reasons, is the supposed opposition between Faith and Science. If one asks such persons why they abandoned the faith of their fathers, they look very wise and answer glibly that Science has undermined Faith. Nay, if you are a good listener, they will even theorize about the matter, and tell you with quite a show of eloquence, that there is a necessary opposition between Faith and Science; that as the one advances, the other must recede. Nor are they at all slow to back up their assertions with arguments which they consider unanswerable. For, say they, is it not written in nearly every book and magazine and pamphlet, issuing from the press to-day, that Science has solved the riddle of the universe; that Science in all its various quests has found neither a spiritual soul nor a personal God, and that therefore it has ruled the supernatural world out of existence? And how could such statements be made, if they had no foundation in fact? Surely, it is unreasonable, not to say harsh and unkind, to

suppose that the authors of these eloquent treatises have conspired against the truth. Therefore, as thus it is written, thus it must be, and that finishes the matter.

Now, what shall we, who still cling to the faith of our childhood, and in that faith kneel in humble adoration beneath the cross of our dying Redeemer — what shall we say in reply to these incontrovertible arguments? Shall we admit that our faith was foolish, and that our hope has been vain? Must the glorious vision of a blissful hereafter, and the consolations flowing therefrom, dissolve before the growing effulgence of Science even as the morning mist vanishes before the light of the rising sun? Or shall we say that modern Science is a huge fraud, a living lie, a pretentious sham, devised by the evil one for the sole purpose of leading unwary mortals into eternal destruction? Neither the one nor the other; for there is a middle way, which gives to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's: which accords to Science its full meed of praise, and does not take from Faith the reverence justly its own.

In the first place, then, we readily admit,

and are proud to acknowledge, that Science has done yoeman's service in unraveling the mysteries of nature, and in bringing to light hidden things whereof the world dreamed not a hundred years ago. It has put its finger upon time-honored theories concerning many physical phenomena, and has proved them to have been but idle dreams. It has gone down into the dark bowels of the earth and ascended to the starry heights of heaven, and everywhere has it written in flaming characters its conquests and its triumphs. It has revolutionized the world by harnessing the forces of nature to the triumphal car of human progress, and guided them with steady hand towards the coveted goal of magnificence and wealth. All this it has done, and much more it will do in the ages to come; yet it never has, and it never will, in its own proper field, impede the onward march of God's Church upon earth, nor in the least degree obscure the clear light of Divine Revelation. For Science and Faith are twin daughters of the same Heavenly Father, and there is naught in this wide world that can mar the harmony and concord established between them on the day of their birth. It is not Faith and Science that are at war;

nor yet Scientists and Theologians strictly so called; but men who misapprehend the mission of Science, or in their ignorance unduly extend the bounds of Faith, and then presumptuously set themselves up as teachers in Israel!

Have you ever stopped to consider the undeniable fact that Faith and Science, when confined to their own proper spheres, move on two different parallel planes? And this other not less undeniable fact, that parallel planes can never meet? Faith and Science treat at times of the same material objects, yet always under different aspects. Faith considers the suprasensible and the spiritual; the whence and the whither as made known by God's special message to man; Science deals with the sensible and the material; with concrete conditions as embodied in present facts. Moreover between the two lies the neutral zone of Metaphysics, which is friendly to both, yet partial to neither. How then can Faith and Science ever come in conflict? Perhaps you will tell me, it is precisely here that the difficulty lies: Science does away with the suprasensible and the spiritual, and consequently Faith has no plane to move on. Science does away with the suprasensible and spiritual, does it? Let us hear,

what do you mean by Science? Do you mean the experimental investigation of sensible phenomena? The study of physical facts by means of the measuring rod, the crucible, the microscope, and the balance? If so, your Science is wholly limited to matter, and cannot tell what lies even so much as a hair's breadth beyond. Or do you apply the name of Science to mathematical calculations, based upon the motion of material particles in space? In that case also, its findings are necessarily circumscribed by the boundaries of matter, and the great beyond remains enveloped in Egyptian darkness. In whatever way, therefore, you define Science, you cannot force from it a denial of the spiritual world, simply because that world lies beyond its ken.

Possibly you contend that the suggested definitions are not adequate, and therefore answer that you assign a wider scope to Science, namely, the observation of physical phenomena together with the study of reality and being; the investigation, not merely of accidental changes, but the origin and destiny of things. Well, you are entitled to abound in your own wisdom, nevertheless you are very much at fault in your terminology. The study of

reality and being, relative to their origin and destiny, does not appertain to the province of Science; that belongs to Metaphysics, and very few scientists there are who feel at ease in those elevated regions. It is true, scientists have a perfect right to draw inferences from their observations; to theorize about the inmost nature of beings; to make conjectures anent the origin of things; but if they do so, they must not speak in the name of Science, but of Philosophy. As scientists they can observe facts; they can investigate the peculiarities of motion, study physical and chemical changes, experiment with the various forces of nature, co-ordinate observed facts and formulate laws, and apply their knowledge thus gathered to the practical affairs of life: but if they wish to leave the world of the senses, and inquire whether there lies anything beyond, they must be content to appear in the somber garb of a philosopher; they can then no longer use measuring rod and balance, but must employ the delicately adjusted syllogism, and conform themselves to its inexorable laws.

In answer to this it might, of course, be said that it makes little difference whether the scientist speaks in the name of Science or of

Philosophy; as long as he can rule the spiritual world out of existence, his efforts must result in the undoing of Supernatural Faith, and so it all comes to the same in the end. Just so: but can he rule the spiritual world out of existence, even if he puts on the philosopher's cap? What have these scientific philosophers accomplished towards unraveling the nature and origin of things? As scientists they have made rapid advance, for instance, in elucidating the various phenomena of life: they have studied all the ills which the flesh is heir to; they have learned to make compounds of marvelous virtue, both to prevent bodily disorders and to cure them; they have analyzed man's brain and dissected his heart; they understand to some extent the function of nearly every muscle and nerve and tissue of the human body: but of that elusive principle which presides over and directs the upbuilding of the living organism, they know absolutely no more than did Aristotle two thousand years ago. If they remain within their own province of scientific investigation, they understand neither life's nature nor its origin; if they cross the boundary lines of Science and enter the domain of Metaphysics, reason compels them,

as it compelled the Greek philosopher of old, to say that the life-principle is of a higher order of being than the material elements which it builds up into the graceful form of a human body, and that in itself it is somehow the product of an intelligent casuality.

Time was, indeed, when scientists fancied they had robbed nature of her secrets; when they imagined that life might be derived from non-life by a proper collocation and combination of atoms; but Science itself, when seriously interrogated, answers that such hopes are but idle dreams, the foolish fancies of visionaries. Despite sensational proclamations, issuing periodically from the laboratories of scientific quacks, it is as true to-day as it has ever been, that life comes only from life; and what life itself may be, Science cannot tell. And as it is with life, in all its various forms and grades, so is it with every other reality which Science ventures to investigate. Ask this idol of the modern world what is the inmost nature of the least mote that floats in the sunbeam, and it is dumb as the Egyptian Sphinx. Ask it what light may be; what electricity; what the ultimate reality of gold, or silver, or of any of the other elements

whereof the diverse beings that make up this world of ours are said to be constituted, and its answer will ever be: "I cannot tell." And this Science, that knows not the implements of its own trade, would ascend the throne of majesty and judge the great unknown that lies beyond the narrow bounds of space and time! For very pity's sake, ye lovers and admirers of Science, do not insult your well beloved by attributing to her pretensions which she would not so much as touch with the tip of her finger.

Touching this point, namely, the inherent inability of Science to tell what may or may not lie beyond the world of the senses, the greatest scientists make the most liberal concessions. Thus Professor Ray Lankester, the well known and distinguished director of the British Natural History Museum, says very pointedly: "The whole order of nature, including living and lifeless matter — man, animal, and gas — is a network of mechanism, the main features and many details of which have been made more or less obvious to the wondering intelligence of mankind by the labor and ingenuity of scientific investigators. But no sane man has ever pretended, since Science

became a definite body of doctrine, that we know, or ever can hope to know, or conceive or the possiblity of knowing, whence this mechanism has come, why it is here, whither it is going, and what there may be or may not be beyond and beside it which our senses are incapable of appreciating. These things are not 'explained' by Science, and never can be." (Letter to the Times, May 19, 1903.) The same was taught by Huxley, the great apostle of Agnosticism. "Science," he stated in an article published in the Fortnightly Review, "has no more to say against the doctrine of Theism than the most ordinary experience has, and it effectually closes the mouths of those who pretend to refute it by objections deduced from physical data." (Fortnightly Review, Vol. XL, 1886.)

Hence according to the statements of its own most capable representatives, Science has nothing to say against the existence of a spiritual world, simply because that world lies beyond the field of scientific inquiry. As Professor Lankester puts it: "It appears to me that science proceeds on its path without any contact with religion, and that religion has not, in its essential qualities, anything to hope

from, or to fear from, science." However, though Science affords no direct proof, either for or against the existence of a spiritual world, yet indirectly it prepares the way for a demonstration that places the reality of such a world beyond all doubt. For does not Science tell us in most eloquent language that every mundane being, which it contemplates, is subject to change? Does it not point persistently to a marvelous interaction of laws whence results a universe of surpassing beauty? Does it not linger in loving delight over a harmony of subordinated existences that is truly divine in its origin and finality? And what are these glowing utterances of Science but the premise of an argument whence reason necessarily infers that there exists, beyond the bounds of this visible world, an invisible, intelligent, unchangeable, and benign First Cause, whose omnipotent will has laid the foundation of the universe; whose infinite goodness has called into existence all things, both great and small; whose boundless wisdom has assigned to each separate being its own proper end, and traced with unerring hand the laws that must guide it in the attainment of that end? Yes, ask Science

whether there exists a spirit world; it will answer, indeed: "I cannot tell," but it will add without delay: "Tell reason to draw the proper and necessary inference from my most certain findings, and that inference will be without fail: "God exists, and that God has created spiritual souls, which He binds to Himself with the bonds of Faith and Hope and Charity, and therefore Supernatural Faith is in very deed my own twin sister, enjoying the same divine birthright as myself, but is fairer of form and more queenly of aspect." Well did the illustrious Kepler, after his brilliant discovery of the laws which still bear his name, cry out in religious awe and reverence: "O God, I think Thy thoughts after Thee."

Possibly the very evidence of this presentation of the matter makes you suspicious of the soundness of my reasoning. Possibly you apprehend that I have indulged in metaphysical word-spinning; that I have turned a logical trick, and thus arrived at a conclusion which is warranted neither by Science nor by Philosophy. For, you will ask, how can scientists, in the face of such evidence to the contrary, maintain so stoutly that they have proved the spiritual world to be but a myth? Or, at

least, that we can never hope to know anything about the existence of such a world? To this question I answer, that scientists in general maintain nothing of the kind. Do you suppose, even for a moment, that the turbid flood of sensationalism, which deluges the pages of magazines and popular science books, issues from the minds of scientists as its fountainhead? Why, things of that sort are but the stock-in-trade of shallow hangers-on; the idle dreams of the camp followers of Science, who would sell their very souls for filthy lucre, or for the empty honor of newspaper notoriety. If you wish to know what Science has to say anent these matters, you must consult the works of real scientists; they are the legitimate interpreters of their own findings; yet they either waive the question of the spiritual world altogether, as lying beyond their proper field of inquiry, or else even pronounce distinctly in favor of its existence. Thus Lord Kelvin, one of the foremost scientists to-day, says very pointedly: "Science positively affirms creating and directive power, which she compels us to accept as an article of belief." (Nineteenth Century and After, June, 1903.) And again: "Science

positively affirms the creative power, and makes every man feel a miracle in himself. Science is not antagonistic to, but a help for religion." (Letter to the Times, May 2, 1903.) The same language is used by Sir Gabriel G. Stokes, another eminent scientist. "The study of the phenomena of nature," he says, "leads us to the contemplation of a Being from whom proceeded the orderly arrangement of natural things that we behold." (Burnet Lectures, p. 327.) So also Clerk-Maxwell, who concluded his famous lecture before the British Association with these eloquent words: "Those aspirations after accuracy in measurements, truth in statement, and justice in action, which we reckon among our noblest attributes as men, are ours because they are essential constituents of the image of Him who in the beginning created, not only the heavens and the earth, but the materials of which heaven and earth consist." Finally, the great Pasteur, whose fame as a scientific investigator is world-wide, said at the end of his long and brilliant career: "The more I know the more nearly does my faith approach that of the Breton peasant. Could I but know it all, my faith would doubtless equal even that of the

Breton peasant woman." (Horgan: Great Catholic Laymen.)

And so I might continue *ad infinitum,* quoting men who hold the very first places in the scientific world, yet who declare in no uncertain terms that Science, so far from ruling the spiritual world out of existence, rather postulates the same as the only final explanation of the visible universe. It is true, there are men like Haeckel and Berthelot, who scout the very idea of God and Religion, but their blasphemous pronunciamentos do by no means voice the prevailing opinion of present-day scientists. Concerning Haeckel and his school, Sir Oliver Lodge, himself a scientist of repute, has this to say: "He is, as it were, a surviving voice from the middle of the nineteenth century; he represents, in clear and eloquent fashion, opinions which then were prevalent among many leaders of thought — opinions which they themselves in many cases, and their successors still more, lived to outgrow; so that by this time Professor Haeckel's voice is as the voice of one crying in the wilderness, not as a pioneer or vanguard of an advancing army, but as the despairing shout of a standard-bearer, still bold and unflinching, but

abandoned by the retreating ranks of his comrades as they march to new orders in a fresh direction." Then Sir Oliver states his own view in these words: "The essence of the mind is design and purpose There are some who deny that there is any design or purpose in the universe at all: but how can that be maintained when humanity itself possesses these attributes? . . . . This is my creed, and it seems to me the only rational creed for a man of science." (Mind and Matter: Hibbert Journal, Feb., 1905.)

Lastly, the strongest proof of the harmlessness of Science, as far as Faith is concerned, we find in the undeniable fact that the Catholic Church, though always safeguarding with jealous care the rights of the supernatural, yet advocates and promotes the study of Science by every means in her power. Every Catholic college and university, all the world over, includes in its curriculum the study of the sciences as an obligatory course; whilst Catholic men, as staunch in their faith as were their forebears in the earliest Christian ages, are in the very forefront of that noble army of scientists who make the study of nature their life-work. Pasteur, Schwann, Duhem, and

scores of others, are names to conjure by even in this our enlightened age; yet they stand for solid Catholic piety, and are held in the highest repute in the Church that claims a supernatural mission on earth. Nor can it be said that the Catholic Church assumes this favorable attitude in sheer self-defense, being forced, as it were, by the spirit of the age to make the most of a desperate situation. If you will take the trouble to read up an unbiased History of Science, you will find Catholic names on its every page, and incidentally you will also find that the bearers of these names were highly honored in the Church whereof they were members.

Now, is it at all likely that the Church, which is said to wield over her members an authority that brooks no gainsaying, would have tolerated, much less encouraged, these studies, if they could possibly endanger the faith which forms the very foundation of all her teachings? Or did she perhaps fail to foresee the final results to which these studies would lead? Neither the one nor the other. She encouraged scientific investigations in the past for the very same reason that she encourages them at present, namely, to lead her

children from the contemplation of nature to the love of nature's God. She has ever realized the truth implied in the oft quoted words of Lord Bacon: "Both reason and experience show conclusively that a little knowledge turneth away from God, but more extended research and study turneth the soul back to God." Hence we may well conclude that Faith has nothing to fear from Science, nor Science from Faith; but men who are ignorant of the one and despise the other are a source of danger to both.

PART SECOND.

I.

ORIGIN AND EFFECTS OF RELIGIOUS PREJUDICE.

Prejudice, taken in its literal significance, means a pre-judgment, or a judgment formed prior to the examination of a question upon which it is made to bear. In its more common acceptation, however, it signifies an habitual state of mind, which leads a person almost unconsciously to form a judgment without examining into the matter whereof there is question. Thus, for instance, if I have a bad opinion of someone, who, let us say, is accused of murder, and then allow that bad opinion to influence me in such a way as to conclude in my own mind that the accused person has committed the crime, though as yet no evidence has been brought forward to prove him guilty, I am properly said to be prejudiced against him, and the unfavorable

judgment which I pass upon him is the natural result of prejudice. The habitual state of my mind with respect to that person is such that I am much more disposed to believe of him what is evil than what is good; I judge his conduct, his words and actions, in the light of the bad opinion which I have formed of his character. In its last analysis, therefore, prejudice is an habitual state of mind which influences our judgments of persons and things, and makes these judgments favorable or unfavorable according as we are well or ill affected towards the persons and things in question.

From this it is readily understood what I mean when I say that Protestants are prejudiced against the Catholic Church. I maintain that they are habitually in a frame of mind which leads them, unconsciously if you will, to interpret everything Catholic in an unfavorable sense. That this is an incontrovertible fact, and not a mere theory, I shall make clear in the several discussions that are to follow; for the present I am concerned only with the origin and necessary effects of religious prejudice.

Though religious prejudice may originate

in a variety of ways, yet it can ultimately be referred to one of three sources. The first of these sources is misapprehension of doctrinal teachings and devotional practices. Thus when the Catholic Church proposes certain doctrines to the belief of her children, or encourages the practice of certain devotions, those outside her fold hear about it, explain the matter in their own way, and not rarely arrive at the conclusion that the doctrine or devotion in question comes in conflict with some clearly defined law, either human or divine. This conclusion once formed, they become, of course, ill disposed towards the Church, fancying that she arrogates to herself an authority which is opposed either to reason or to revelation. Of this we find an instance in the early Church, when the Christians were accused of the horrible crime of feasting on the flesh of infants, which they were said to immolate in their sacrificial rites. The sole foundation for this slander was the belief of the faithful that in the sacrifice of the Mass bread and wine were changed into the body and blood of Christ, both of which they received in Holy Communion as the food of their souls. The pagans, unable to under-

stand so sublime a doctrine, interpreted the teaching of the Church in accordance with their own carnal views, and so represented the holiest of rites as the most shocking of crimes.

Something similar happened in more recent times, when at the Vatican Council the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff was defined as an article of Catholic belief. That doctrine, if but rightly understood, contains nothing at which fair-minded Protestants can justly take offense. For it means neither more nor less than that the Pope, when acting in his capacity as Supreme Teacher of all the faithful, is specially assisted by God, so that through the guidance of the Holy Spirit he is preserved from teaching anything that is opposed to faith or morals. It is a doctrine that is solidly based upon the teaching of Christ Himself, and was implicitly believed by the faithful from the very beginning of Christianity. Yet how Protestants were scandalized at this harmless definition of the council! They could not find terms strong enough to express adequately their indignation at this exhibition of popish arrogance. And what was the principal reason of all this excitement? Nothing but a most ludicrous misapprehension of the defini-

tion in question. Some thought that the Pope had been declared impeccable, so that, human though he was, he could not commit sin. Others fancied that he had been made a sort of prophet, to whom, as occasions demanded, new revelations were imparted. Others, again, would have it that he could neither tell a lie nor make a mistake, no matter what he might say or about what topic he might discourse. No wonder they were scandalized at so monstrous a doctrine; but that doctrine was their own false interpretation of a definition warranted by Christ's most certain teaching. And so hundreds of instances might be adduced, where misapprehension of doctrinal teachings or devotional practices has given rise to false judgments, which in course of time have settled down into almost irremovable prejudice.

The second source of religious prejudice we find in deliberate calumny, scattered broadcast by the enemies of the Church. From this source flow many prejudices that have come down to us from the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. As an instance take the immortal calumny, started by Luther and his associates, that before the Reformation the

Bible was withheld from the people. After their break with Rome, these men tried by every means in their power to create the impression that in Catholic times the Bible had been an unknown book, at least as far as the laity were concerned. How well they succeeded in their efforts we all know; for even in this our enlightened age it is still quite a common belief among Protestants that Luther first made the Bible accessible to the people. This effort on the part of the reformers I call a deliberate calumny, because as educated men they must have been aware that before the first Protestant version was published, there had been issued, in the various modern languages, nearly two hundred editions of the Bible, even though the art of printing was still a matter of recent invention. Besides, Luther himself, in an unguarded moment, stated explicitly: "When I was young I accustomed myself to read the Bible, and I read it often." (Table-talk: ed. 1568, fol. 16.) The same was stated by Melanchthon, his fellow reformer, who even added that in his boyhood "the Bible was read much more frequently by the young than was the custom after the Reformation." (Lampert: Lexicon, art. The

Bible, p. 460.) Yet in their youth both Luther and Melanchthon were Catholics, and so they must have been aware that the people had access to the Bible.

From the same source comes the old-time Protestant belief, now dying a slow but sure death, that the Pope is Anti-Christ. Luther had always been a firm believer in the Papal Supremacy, but when his writings were condemned by Rome, he fell into a furious rage, and tried to justify his course by representing the Pope as the impersonation of all that was evil, against whom the whole Christian world was bound to take up arms. (Letter to German Nobles.) So also against his better judgment did he condemn the Mass as an act of idolatry; preached against indulgences as a means to extort money, and discovered a hundred other enormities which he had never dreamt of until Rome took an authoritative stand against his innovations. Of course, neither he nor his associates expected that all they said would be believed, but then they well understood the truth of the old adage: "Fling enough dirt and some will stick." And some did stick and sticks to-day, and you can no

more remove it than you can wash the blackness off the Ethiopian's skin.

The third source of religious prejudice is supplied by Catholics themselves, and consists in the disagreement between their faith and their practice. There are too many Catholics who seem to put into practice Luther's oft-quoted rule of conduct: "Believe firmly and sin boldly." They believe in the Church of which they are members; they hold that good works are necessary for salvation; they admit without thought of contradiction that the laws of the Church are just, even as the commandments of God are sacred; and then convinced of all this, admitting it all in theory, they disregard it entirely in practice: They lead lives that are a continuous violation of the precepts of the Church and of the commandments of God. In their private conduct they are impure and contentious, and in their public careers, venal and corrupt: they drink and swear and quarrel and cheat and boodle as if there were no God in heaven, nor a Church of Christ upon earth. They say Lord, Lord, and then show no more concern for the will of their Father in heaven than the pagans did for the gods whom they had learned to

despise. Compared to the totality of Catholics, such cases are indeed exceptions; yet Protestants, strongly impressed by the disorderly lives of these men, are liable to suspect similar disorders in others, thus acting on the time-honored principle: *Ex uno disce omnes.* From one infer all the rest. Nor do they stop here, but they put the blame of it all upon the Church of which these name-Catholics are members.

All this is intensified when somewhat similar disorders are observed in individual members of the clergy, or in persons consecrated to God. Though there be only one case in a thousand, yet this is quite sufficient to drag the fair name of every priest and monk and nun into the mire. If you will, this is unfair on the part of our non-Catholic brethren; they ought to remember that no matter how true and holy a religion may be, it cannot be expected to make saints of persons who fail to put its precepts into practice; they ought to bear in mind that among the twelve Apostles, trained by Christ Himself, there was one whom the gentlest of men felt justified in calling a devil; nor ought they to forget that what they blame in Catholics is of daily

occurrence among themselves: — all this is true; our non-Catholic brethren are unfair when they blame the Church for the misdeeds of her disobedient children; nevertheless the fact remains that they often do judge after this fashion, and so the mischief is done.

Thus, then, partly through misapprehension of Catholic doctrines and practices; partly because of slanders and calumnies scattered broadcast by religious innovators; and partly on account of the evil lives of individual Catholics, those outside the Church are unfavorably impressed: and these impressions, gaining force through frequent repetition of the causes from which they proceeded, little by little create a state of mind that is either openly or secretly hostile to everything Catholic. Nor does this state of mind disappear with the individual in whom it was first produced, but it is handed down from father to son and from mother to daughter, becoming a sort of family heirloom which each succeeding generation guards with jealous care. With the lapse of time individual charges may lose their force; particular accusations may become somewhat indefinite in outline; calumnies and misconceptions may all merge into

one: yet the unfavorable opinion, formed for one reason or another, remains as a stable condition, and acts as a distorting medium by reason of which the views and practices of the Church are necessarily misrepresented.

From this it may readily be inferred what must be the effects of religious prejudice in the case of persons who are under its sway. Already convinced that out of the Catholic Church nothing good can come, they never think of considering her claims to be the Church of Christ. Such persons may feel in their hearts that their own particular form of religion is wofully defective; they may see that it bears the hall-mark of human invention; they may be disturbed in conscience and anxiously cast about for a religion that will satisfy their needs: yet in all their search after truth they will never turn to the Catholic Church: for "Can anything of good come from Nazareth?" Nay worse, if by some chance they hear an explanation of Catholic doctrines, no matter how reasonable, how clear, how solid, they will only harden their hearts, so that having eyes they see not, and having ears they hear not. They may not be able to answer the arguments brought forward in

favor of the Catholic cause, yet this does not in the least disturb them; for they only shrug their shoulders and say: "It is some Jesuitical trick, a juggling with words, another evidence of priest-craft, from which every true Protestant is in honor bound to flee as from the sight of a serpent." They are in search of the truth, but between it and them there is fixed a gulf which they cannot cross. Over their eyes hangs the thick veil of prejudice, which even the light of God's own truth cannot pierce; and so, having lost faith in their own religion, and despairing of finding the truth anywhere, they are finally submerged in the vast ocean of religious indifferentism out of which there is no redemption.

Another effect of religious prejudice manifests itself in the constant misrepresentation of things Catholic. To the prejudiced person the Catholic Church stands for all that is selfish, narrow-minded, intolerant, and deceitful, and in that light he judges of all he sees at home or hears abroad. If he observes Catholics at their devotions, kneeling in humble prayer in the house of God, he regards them either as superstitious or as entirely

wrapt up in outward ceremonies and empty formalities; as persons who honor God with their lips, but whose heart is far from Him. Should he come across some magnificent manifestation of Catholic charity, or self-sacrfice in the cause of religion, he forthwith puts it down as a piece of Pharisaical hypocrisy, or as stupid fanaticism which will surrender life itself in the furtherance of an unworthy cause. Thus on whatever he sees or hears he makes his comments as prompted by deep-rooted prejudice. Nay, he will dress up these comments in the form of a racy magazine article, or sensational communication to newspapers, intersperse them liberally with scandals real or imaginery, and thus not only harm himself by wandering farther and farther from the truth, but also lead astray others, who, till they read his *personal* observations, were still well disposed.

Nor does the matter end with the harm thus caused to Protestants, but weak-kneed Catholics, who were only waiting for an excuse to give up the practice of their religion, eagerly pounce upon these silly stories and proclaim in trumpet tones their indignation at the way things are done in the Church of which they

have the misfortune to be members. Whilst others who mean well become ill at ease when brought face to face with such revelations, and though they will never prove untrue to the religion which has been to them a solace in all their trials, still they lose much of that childlike confidence and implicit trust which heretofore was the sunshine of their lives.

Perhaps some may think that I am exaggerating; that I am drawing on my imagination; that I am trying without just cause to represent the Catholic Church as the victim of a widespread conspiracy, whose ultimate object is the destruction of Catholicism. If any there be who take that view, I can only invite them to study the matter for themselves. They need but open a current number of our monthly magazines, or turn over the pages of our Sunday papers, and before they have proceeded very far, they will come upon a communication from some Protestant Divine, or from some non-Catholic missionary, either male or female, who made a flying trip to Porto Rico or the Philippine Island, or to some Catholic country on the European continent, and has discovered as by divine guidance a demoralized state of Catholicism which

keen-eyed observers, who resided in these respective place for years, had failed to observe. Nay, not only do they emphasize the supposed demoralization of the Catholic Church, but they insist with many loud clamors that nothing will save these countries but the pure gospel of Protestantism, and the heaven-born blessing of our Public School system. And what is the source of all this outcry? Does it proceed from a willful misapprehension of facts? Is it but a deliberate attempt at blackmailing? I do not think so. I have too much respect for the authors of these false reports to entertain such an idea even for a moment. I give them credit for being well-meaning men and women, but they are blinded by prejudice. They set out on their voyages of discovery fully determined to catch the Catholic Church at playing the role which Protestant traditions have ascribed to her for the last three hundred years, and thus viewing everything through the distorting medium of prejudice, they easily found what they sought, and then, in their charity for their neighbor and zeal for the pure gospel, they generously shared their discovery with a gullible public.

This, then, is religious prejudice as we find

it in its concrete form to-day. It is a prejudice that holds the hearts of well-meaning men and women encased in a coat of mail which no argument can pierce and no logic can shatter; yet what mere reasoning can not accomplish, may still be effected by the warmth of God's love and the gentle force of divine grace, and in sole reliance on this, shall I venture to deal with the various phases of religious prejudice in the following discussions.

II.

THE ANCIENT CHURCH AND MODERN FREE-THOUGHT.

There is a general persuasion among Protestants to the effect that the Catholic Church places undue restraint on freedom of thought. According to their view of the matter, Catholics are bound to think as the Pope thinks; to judge as he judges; to approve what he approves, and to condemn what he condemns. Whether there be question of Faith or Science, Philosophy or Politics, in one way or another, Rome must sound the keynote before any Catholic, lay or cleric, man or woman, dares express an opinion. Hence they conclude, not only that we are perpetually hampered in every effort of mental progress, but that we basely abdicate the freedom which is the birthright of every rational being, and become intellectual bond-slaves to an individual who is perhaps much our inferior in men-

tal attainments. Consequently, if nothing else could be brought against the Catholic Church, this alone would be sufficient to condemn her in an age when freedom of thought is the acknowledged right of even the lowest savage.

This certainly looks like a formidable arraignment, and if it can be sustained, the Catholic Church is decidedly out of tune with modern conditions of things. If Catholics are in such absolute subjection to their ecclesiastical superiors that they can have practically no mind of their own, I do not blame anyone for having an unfavorable opinion of their Church. Nay, if matters stand thus, I have nothing further to say, unless it be to express my regret that I have the misfortune of being a Catholic. For such slavery there is warrant neither in the Bible nor in Tradition, whilst reason rejects it as unbearable despotism. But is this the actual condition of things? Or is it simply a distorted view of the matter as seen through the medium of religious prejudice? To this query a well-meaning Catholic, justly indignant at imputations so unreasonable, once made a reply, that the Church interferes no more with the freedom of

thought than the multiplication table interferes with mathematical calculations. Possibly he yet he was as near the truth as his Protestant found it somewhat difficult to sustain his view, adversary who charged him with intellectual slavery. As usual, the full truth lies midway, as I shall now endeavor to make clear.

To form a correct judgment of this matter, we must first of all bear in mind that the Catholic Church claims to have received authority from her Divine Founder to teach all things whatsoever He commanded. The validity of this claim she proves by arguments that are calculated to convince anyone who gives the matter serious thought, and who is disposed to acknowledge the truth wherever he may find it. In this capacity of divinely appointed teacher, she exercises the right and discharges the duty of watching over the faith and morals of her members. Now as faith and morality find expression, not only in exterior conduct, but also in thought and volition, the Church must necessarily claim authority to place restrictions upon both, in order to carry out the intentions of her Divine Founder.

First, then, I readily grant that the Church does place a certain restraint upon freedom

of thought; but I contend that this restraint is exercised along lines where freedom of thought is in the very nature of things illegitimate. Whenever the Church makes any restrictions, it is always a question of faith or morals. Now as regards morals, I do not think that the matter is open for discussion; for since the Church does practically nothing more than enforce the commandments of the decalogue, as applied to the Christian dispensation, no one can find fault with her on that score. Moreover if there be any points that would seem to admit of dispute, they are all reducible to the question of faith. Hence as I take for granted that my readers have the greatest reverence for the decalogue, I think it superfluous to justify the Church when she endeavors by every means in her power to enforce the observance of its commandments. Consequently the discussion can legitimately be restricted to the authority which the Church exercises in matters of faith.

In respect to this point, the Church maintains that her authority is final, so that her decisions are not subject to correction by any one of her children, no matter what be his learning and erudition. Hence cencerning

such truths as have certainly been revealed, and therefore are evidently contained in the sacred deposit of faith, she does not allow her children to theorize. Thus, for instance, the Divinity of Christ, the necessity of Baptism for salvation, the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, and other revealed truths already established as certain, no Catholic may call in question. The faithful have full liberty to study these truths; they may try to understand them more perfectly; they may even excogitate difficulties and urge objections; they may discuss the matter in learned books or popular treatises: but in whatever they do they must see to it that the truth once established as certain be never made a matter of doubt. In this, if you will, there is a certain restraint; freedom of thought is interfered with to some extent; but doesn't it strike you that this restraint is after all very much like that which a sensible teacher puts upon his pupils with regard to the multiplication table? He is quite willing to let them work all sorts of examples; he takes special delight in proposing to them a vast variety of problems; he is greatly pleased if they devise ways and methods of their own:

but in all their work, in their every solution, he insists upon profound respect for the multiplication table. If one of his young charges discovers, for instance, that two times two makes five, instead of the traditional four, no matter how brilliant an intellectual feat the young genius may consider his discovery, the teacher is inexorable, and gives him an authoritative warning that such departures from well-established traditions must not recur in future. Of course, the hapless discoverer may take this warning very much amiss; he may pout and grumble and express his disgust with the old school where such restraint is put upon budding genius: but all to no purpose; the teacher insists upon seeing four in the result whenever the factors are two and two. Nor does the community that engaged his services find any fault with his apparent intellectual despotism. In fact, were he to accommodate himself in this matter to the advanced thought of his pupils, he would soon receive notice to look for some other field of usefulness. He would be altogether too progressive for men who hold that truth is truth till the end of reckoning.

The parity between the action of the teacher

just referred to, and the course pursued by the Church in matters of faith, lies in this, that as the multiplication table is but an expression of certain natural truths which admit of no change, so also is the teaching of the Church but an outward manifestation of supernatural truths that are absolutely unchangeable. The fact is, wherever truth is recognized as certain, freedom of thought ceases. This follows necessarily from the laws that govern our mental operations. Thus, for instance, when I look at my watch, my senses refer an image of it to the brain; my intellect receives that image as presented; it recognizes in it all that is predicated of a watch, and it is compelled by its own nature to form the judgment: "This is a watch." It is not at liberty to conclude that it is a horse, or a steam engine. And so in all other cases, wherever the intellect recognizes truth, there freedom of thought is out of place.

Hence in regard to revealed truths that are quite certain, the Church justly requires that her children should think as she thinks. In this she does not interfere with freedom of thought. To demand that even in regard to these certain truths she should allow her

children to think as they please, would be just as absurd as to require of a teacher to allow his pupils to follow their own foolish fancies with respect to the multiplication table. You will perhaps say that Protestant Churches are much more liberal in this matter. So they are: but what does that show? That they have greater regard for intellectual freedom? No: not at all. It only shows that they are not convinced of possessing the truth. When Protestant Churches permit their members to entertain their own private views concerning revealed truths, they openly confess that these truths are not at all certain. If they hold anything else, they simply stultify themselves by the implicit declaration that in their Churches it matters not whether one believes truth or falsehood. Hence so far from blaming the Catholic Church for denying freedom of thought in regard to well established religious truths, they should rather acknowledge her as the only true Church, for in this she alone is in full accord with reason and common sense.

But we are told that the Church extends her restrictions not only to truths that are well established and certain, but also to others

about which she herself has as yet made no final decision. Nay, she even leaves her own proper sphere, which is limited to revealed truths, and claims supervision over the study of philosophy and the sciences; yet such restriction and supervision must necessarily interfere with freedom of thought. Hence, granted that she is completely within her own rights when she keeps vigilant watch and ward over the faith, she is certainly meddling in affairs not her own when she reaches out to what lies beyond the bounds of revelation. In this she cannot fall back upon the multiplication table to justify her actions.

In answer to this, I again grant that the Church extends her authority beyond the bounds of what is strictly supernatural and absolutely certain. I also concede that she cannot appeal directly to the multiplication table as a justifying reason; but I deny the inference that she meddles in affairs not her own, and that she interferes with legitimate freedom of thought. To make this matter clear, let me ask you to transport yourselves in spirit to any convenient place on the seashore: to some harbor or port, for instance,

where ships are constantly arriving from distant shores, and whence they are departing for lands beyond the sea. As you stand there, you see before you the broad and heaving ocean, with its billows and its waves, boundless in expanse and fathomless in depth. At the entrance of the harbor and all along the coast, you notice bright-colored objects, stationary, indeed, yet rising and falling with the sea. If you have but a little patience, you will also observe how every ship that enters the harbor or leaves it, or cruises along the coastline, directs her course in reference to those bright, bobbing objects, or buoys as they are called. Now I ask you, is the freedom of these ships interfered with by said buoys? You will answer, yes, in a certain sense it is. It seems that no ship ever ventures to approach that part of the sea where they keep watch. And what, do you think, is the reason? If you don't know, just ask the pilot as he guides his ship past one of them. He will answer that they are danger signals, and to disregard them would mean death and disaster; for they are moored to jagged rocks and treacherous shoals barely covered by the water. If you are not satisfied yet, ask him again, if he does

not consider it an impertinence on the part of the civil authorities to have put up these signals, and so to hamper his course? Most likely his only answer would be a look of surprise, asking as plainly as words could do: "Why aren't you shut up in a lunatic asylum?"

Apply all this to the action of the Catholic Church in respect to studies which are not directly concerned with truths evidently of faith or absolutely certain. Beyond these truths there extends a vast ocean of unexplored probabilities, over which the Church allows her children to roam as reason or good sense may direct. She enforces no definite system of philosophy, nor enjoins any particular method of scientific investigation; all this she leaves to men who have a liking and genius for that sort of thing; but when conclusions are arrived at that are not warranted by facts and run counter to the truths over which she keeps guard, she sounds the alarm, and bids investigators beware lest they run upon hidden rocks and shoals, and thus lose the fruit of all their labor. Hence her supervision is directive as well as restrictive. She points out the dangers that threaten short-

sighted human reason, when completely left to its own invention. Nor yet is she contented with this negative help which she extends to all human efforts; but like a lighthouse built on a jutting promontory, she points the way to safety and success. The very fact that she emphasizes truths which cannot be called in question, is a positive help towards the discovery of other truths which lie still hidden in unexplored regions. Thus her stout defense of the existence of a spiritual world, not only saves her children from wasting their time and energy in the vain effort to construct an agnostic philosophy and materialistic science, but enables them to bring both philosophy and science into harmony with the certain teachings of faith, and thus prepare the way for the discovery of facts and relations which otherwise would have remained undetected for ages. As Mr. Mallock, a well known Protestant writer, so pointedly puts it: "The infallible teaching authority of the Church is not a fetter only; it is a support also; and those who cling to it can venture fearlessly, as explorers, into currents of speculation that would sweep away altogether men who did but trust to their own powers of swim-

ming." (Is Life Worth Living? c. XII, p. 310.)

If you will, all this imposes a certain restraint; but it is a restraint upon license, not upon freedom. The Catholic philosopher is not at liberty to play fast and loose with the immutable principles of knowledge, and thus by hook and by crook arrive at the conclusion that all being centers in his own little self, that he is the one and the all, and that he is accountable to no one except to his own metaphysical idea of right and wrong. Nor is the Catholic scientist permitted to juggle with observed facts in such wise that he is enabled to derive from them plausible arguments, whereby he persuades himself that he is but a half-baked statue of clay, differing only from the clod which he spurns with his foot in the more complex combination of the constituent atoms. Neither has the Catholic moralist leave from his Church to interpret the precepts of the decalogue in a manner that eliminates all objective distinction between virtue and vice; that puts falsehood on a par with truth, and drags down the fair form of purity into the loathsome mire of lust. Yes, such restraint there is; but who, whether Catholic or Prot-

estant, would dare to make that a matter of complaint? It is only the infidel, the materialist, the libertine, who can consistently chafe under such restraint.

And here it is in place to remark, that this fetish of the modern world, which is set up for adoration in the sanctum of our printing establishments, and is carried about as a totem by men and women who call themselves educated, is the vilest of impostors. It is not freedom of thought, but treason to truth; a base betrayal of man's reasonable nature, which bids him respect truth in all its bearings. Man's reason is so constituted that he must recognize the truth of certain principles, unless blinded by the influence of a perverted will. Yet in the recognition of truth his freedom of thought becomes limited. The moment he finds that a certain proposition is true, he is no longer at liberty to cling to its contradictory; for that means assent to falsehood. Hence the more extensive a man's knowledge grows, the more restricted becomes his freedom of thought. Now these very men who raise the hue and cry against the Catholic Church, because she places certain restrictions upon the thoughts of her children, pose before

the world as the wisest of their generation. They talk and write as if they knew all that's worth knowing, and yet they demand perfect liberty to think as they please! Do they not stultify themselves by making demands that are rendered impossible by the very laws of thought? Do they not betray their own reasonable nature by sacrificing reason upon the altar of passion? Freedom of thought, as understood by the opponents of the Catholic Church, means license to think about anything and everything just as one pleases; yet this can be done only in one of two cases: First, when a person has no certain knowledge about anything, and so it doesn't matter much what he thinks; secondly, when he fancies, indeed, that he has certain knowledge of things, but by a deliberate betrayal of his own reasonable nature makes himself completely indifferent to truth and falsehood, so that he would as soon give his intellectual assent to a lie as to an acknowledgment of the truth. Neither of which positions affords matter for boasting.

Furthermore, as this pretended freedom of thought is an insult to right reason, so also is it the undoing of virtue. For freedom of thought must, in the very nature of things,

lead to free expression of thought. The one is conditioned by the other. If a man can think as he pleases, he can speak and write as he pleases. If he thinks that man is but a groveling animal, and therefore at liberty to satisfy his brutish cravings without restraint, what is there to prevent him from preaching his gospel of lust to the nations, and so reduce the world to a state of moral depravity for which the Cities of the Plain were consumed by fire and brimstone? If he thinks that all authority, whether human or divine, is unjustifiable tyranny, why may he not give expression to these thoughts, and so prepare the way for universal anarchy? Perhaps you say, outward expression of thought must necessarily be restrained by law, for without such restraint social order is impossible. True: but on what principles will you base your restraint, if you concede to every one the right to think as he pleases? What is rightly thought can be rightly expressed; for if a man has a right to believe what is false, he must have a right to do what is evil: the one is correlative of the other.

Nor is this mere theorizing. Men who advocate this false freedom of thought never

dream of putting restraint upon its outward expression. Hence it is that from the printing presses of the world there pours forth day by day a stream of pollution that poisons the very atmosphere, and falls like a blight upon heart and home. A great part of what is called literature is but a mass of reeking foulness, which no pure-minded men or women can read without feeling the blush of shame burning like fire upon their cheeks. Whilst works of more serious pretensions frequently teem with views so atheistical and blasphemous that even pagan censors would have condemned the writers to perpetual banishment. This is the freedom of thought against which the Catholic Church, in the name and by the authority of her Divine Founder, utters her solemn "Thou shalt not: — thou shalt not kill thy brother's soul; thou shalt not blaspheme the Lord thy God!" Will you blame her for it? If not, then do not accuse her of intellectual despotism; for she puts restraint only upon a license, not upon liberty.

III.

TOLERATION AND INTOLERANCE.

The restraint which the Catholic Church places upon freedom of thought, is something for which all Catholics have reason to be sincerely thankful. For this restraint is on the part of the Church an open and bold profession that she is in conscious possession of the truth in matters of faith and morals. Besides it is practically the only force that counteracts the downward trend of modern religious thought, and thus is instrumental in saving Christianity from degenerating into a refined form of paganism, towards which the non-Catholic world is rushing without let or hinderance. Hence if but rightly understood, the authority exercised by the Catholic Church in respect to freedom of thought can give offense to no one; for in reality it is not a restraint upon freedom, but upon license.

There are, however, not wanting men who

shrug their shoulders at all this, and say that theoretically the Catholic Church may be right, but considering the matter practically she is decidedly wrong. For whatever may be said in behalf of her authority in matters of faith and morals, it is quite certain that she has no right to carry her pretensions to authority so far as to take away freedom of conscience; yet every one knows that she aims at nothing less, seeing that she makes religious intolerance an essential article of her creed. Not only does she maintain that her own doctrines are true, but she condemns the beliefs of all other denominations as false. She is not satisfied with claiming unrestrained freedom to preach and teach and worship after her own fashion, but like the dog in the manger, she will not allow any one else to touch what she herself cannot use. Nay, worse still, she carries her pretensions even beyond the bounds of space and time, claiming an exclusive title to the kingdom of heaven, and thus assigns to Protestants and Jews and Gentiles a portion in that place where everlasting horror dwelleth. This is not authority, but tyranny; it is intolerance carried to its extreme limit, and therefore theorize as you please, in prac-

tice the Catholic Church stands for intellectual and religious despotism.

This is, I believe, a fair statement of the Protestant charge of intolerance urged against the Catholic Church. It is a charge that has come down to us from the very birth of Protestantism, and is urged with fresh vigor in our own day, when religious indifference makes non-Catholics tolerant of almost any form of belief and worship. Nor is the charge wholly without foundation; for the Catholic Church is and always will be intolerant, though in quite a different sense from that which is implied in the charge brought against us by our non-Catholic brethren. To understand this matter properly, we must first say a word about the different forms of intolerance, at least in so far as it has a direct bearing upon the subject in hand.

Intolerance is twofold: civil and dogmatic. Civil intolerance finds expression in the enactment of laws against forms of worship which are at variance with the religion of the country in question. Of this we find an instance in the case of Catholic Spain, where until a few years ago Protestants were not allowed to build churches, and hold public religious meet-

ings. Similar instances we meet with in countries under Protestant rule, as, for example, in England, where during the time of the penal laws all Catholic worship was prohibited, and Catholic subjects were compelled under pain of exorbitant fines, to attend Protestant worship. This form of intolerance extends itself not rarely to purely civil affairs, in as much as it restricts those not of the fold in the undisturbed enjoyment of their rights as free citizens; excludes them from participation in the government of the state; closes up against them all places of honor and positions of trust; makes of them Helots and serfs, hewers of wood and carriers of water, and leaves them nothing but death to look forward to as a deliverance from their thraldom. Of this extreme phase of civil intolerance we had, up to comparatively recent times, a most striking example in Ireland, where through religious motives a whole nation was reduced to a condition of civil serfdom.

Dogmatic intolerance, on the other hand, concerns itself directly only with doctrinal teaching, and finds expression in the pulpit rather than in legislative halls. It is essentially opposed to religious indifferentism, and

defends its position on the ground that there can be only one true religion. Hence as truth is necessarily intolerant of falsehood, any Church that considers herself the sole representative of the true religion must *ipso facto* open the doors to dogmatic intolerance. In respect to civil affairs such a Church may work hand in hand with other denominations, but when there is question of doctrine, fellowship becomes impossible; because truth can make no compromise with falsehood.

This being premised, we may now inquire to what extent the charge of intolerance, urged against the Catholic Church, can be sustained. As is plain, the matter lends itself easily to an historical treatment; because intolerance manifests itself outwardly, and must, therefore, leave its record on the pages of history. Yet I shall not treat it historically, for the simple reason that such treatment would require, not one discussion only, but at least a dozen, since each single charge would have to be considered separately. Of course, in taking this stand, I lay myself open to the suspicion of being afraid to remove the veil from the dead past, lest I should expose to view the proverbial skeleton in the closet. Still this

suspicion, I believe, may be removed in a very summary manner. First of all I maintain, without any fear of being proved in the wrong, that the past offers not a single instance of unjustifiable intolerance which can be imputed to the Catholic Church as a religious organization. Catholic kings and emperors, magistrates and governors, have persecuted and oppressed other religious denominations that were already peaceably established in the exercise of their rights, but whenever that happened, they acted without the sanction of their Church. The Church herself has always maintained, as she maintains to-day, that "it is sinful to force people to join her communion, or to punish for heresy or false religion, those outside her fold." She has always put into practice the words of St. Paul: "What have I to do with judging them that are outside? Them that are outside God will judge." (I Cor. v., 12, 13.) I know some will say that all this is mere theory; that in practice the Church has followed quite a different course. For, not to mention other instances of intolerance, did she not give her sanction to the war against the Albigenses? Certainly she did: but, my friends, did you

ever read an unbiased history of that war? If you did, you know as well as I do, that on the Catholic side it was simply a question of self-defense. Suppose that some thousand fanatics were to pour into this fair city of St. Louis, with the avowed purpose of establishing a new religion, and that, in order to carry their purpose the more speedily into effect, they were to burn down your churches, murder your priests and ministers, and outrage your wives and daughters, doing away as far as they could with all law and order, would you blame any Church authority for urging the civil magistrates to use effective measures in order to suppress such violence? If you would not, please don't blame the Catholic Church for having sanctioned the war against the Albigenses; for these sectaries perpetrated crimes much more horrible than those which I have mentioned, and the war against them was not sanctioned by the Church until all other measures to keep them within the bounds of law and order had utterly failed. Similarly in every other instance where the Church lent her authority to severe measures taken against persons not of her fold; it was always in the defense of law and order, to protect rights

which no one could call in question. Other persecutions she did not sanction, because she held that them not of the fold God would judge.

Likely enough some will say, it matters little whether these persecutions were sanctioned by the Church or not, they will always remain eloquent witnesses to Catholic intolerance. To this I answer that many of these eloquent witnesses might be silenced in very short order, if by a sort of cross examination the true story were dragged from their lying lips; for there are many false witnesses, and their testimony doth not agree. However, as there is no time for this now, I shall close the case by an argument of recrimination. It is this: Every instance of intolerance that you can bring against Catholics, I will meet with a similar instance against Protestants, and when you have come to your last one, I shall still have a score to spare. If you point to the persecution of the Jews and Moors in Spain, I point to a much more atrocious persecution of Catholics in England. If you complain of legislation against Protestants in France and Austria and other Catholic countries, I respond by complaining of a like legislation against

Catholics in Prussia and Sweden and every other Protestant country on the face of the earth. If you instance the cruelties resorted to by the Spanish Inquisition, I bring forward similar cruelties practiced by the Genevan Inquisition of Calvin, and the Court of High Commission of Elizabeth. Hence if you must call Catholics intolerant, be it so, but do unto yourselves as you do to others, and there will be no cause for quarrel.

Finally, to take away all anxiety lest I should somehow have played you a trick, I invite your attention to the following extract taken from the work of a Protestant writer, who cannot be suspected of bias in favor of the Catholic Church. The writer in question is W. E. Lecky, who in his book entitled, "Rationalism in Europe," has this to say about Protestant intolerance. "What shall we say of a church that was but a thing of yesterday; a church that had as yet no service to show, no claims upon the gratitude of mankind; a church that was by profession the creature of private judgment, and was in reality generated by the intrigues of a corrupt court, which nevertheless suppressed by force worship that multitudes deemed necessary for

their salvation, and by all her organs, and with all her energies, persecuted those who clung to the religion of their fathers? What shall we say of a religion which comprised at most but a fourth part of the Christian world, and which the first explosion of private judgment had shivered into countless sects, which was nevertheless so pervaded by the spirit of dogmatism that each of these sects asserted its distinctive doctrines with the same confidence, and persecuted with the same unhesitating virulence, as the Church which was venerable with the homage of more than twelve centuries? . . . Persecution among early Protestants was a distinct and definite doctrine, digested into elaborate treatises, and enforced against the most inoffensive as against the most formidable sects. It was the doctrine of the palmiest days of Protestantism. It was taught by those who are justly esteemed its leaders. (Vol. II. pp. 57–61.)

With this verdict against Protestant intolerance, deliberately and circumstantially rendered by a Protestant judge, I can safely close the records of the past. If Catholic rulers were intolerant, and manifested that intolerance by persecuting for religion's sake, they

acted in direct opposition to the mind of their Church; whereas Protestants, according to their own showing, "made persecution a distinct and definite doctrine, enforced against the most inoffensive as against the most formidable sects."

Confining ourselves, therefore, to a consideration of the present, can it be said that the Catholic Church is intolerant? The answer to this question is both yes and no. It is no, when there is question of civil intolerance. The Church does not advocate, nor even desire, the enactment of laws which would restrict the freedom of worship. A course of action as is at present pursued by the infidel government of France, and such as was attempted some thirty years ago by Protestant Prussia, would never be tolerated by the Catholic Church, even though non-Catholic subjects formed but an insignificant minority. She takes conditions as they are; so that wherever non-Catholic forms of worship have a *de facto* existence, she does not allow Catholic governments to legislate against them, so long as there is no breach of public order. It is true enough, a conscious possession of the truth in religious matters makes it encum-

bent upon her to take proper measures that the faith of her children be not endangered; but this duty does not demand that established rights of other believers be disregarded. Hence the apprehension sometimes expressed by Protestants, that if the Catholic Church were to obtain legislative control in any country, Protestant citizens would be deprived of their rights, is wholly without foundation. Were this whole country to become Catholic, with the exception of a few thousand Protestants, the Catholic Church would not only tolerate this vanishing minority, but would effectively protect them against all unjust aggressors. When in earlier times the Jews were persecuted by the whole world, they found security and shelter in the shadow of the Vatican; and so also are Protestants perfectly secure in the enjoyments of their rights, wherever the Catholic Church has legislative control.

An apparent exception to this is found in the fact that in countries which are entirely Catholic, the Church favors prohibitive legislation against the introduction of new forms of worship; but in this she is as completely within her own rights as is the American gov-

ernment when it excludes undesirable immigrants from its shores. Any state has the inherent right to exclude foreigners from its territory, whenever such exclusion is deemed necessary for the country's welfare; hence if such legislation be advocated in order to safeguard the religion of the people, it cannot be put down as a manifestation of religious intolerance. This legislation has nothing in common with that which is usually called class-legislation; it does not discriminate between citizen and citizen, but only refuses to admit to the rights of citizens persons considered undesirable.

Another apparent exception, made much of by Protestants, is the fact that the Catholic Church uses very severe measures against such of her members as abandon the true faith and set up as heretics. She cuts them off from her communion, places them under a ban, prevents them as far as she is able from spreading their error, and after their death refuses them Christian burial. These measures are severe, and a superficial observer might be inclined to look upon them as manifestations of unjustifiable intolerance; yet in reality they are but a legitimate exercise of her di-

vinely conferred authority as teacher and lawgiver. Does not our own government, for instance, forbid its citizens to proclaim publicly doctrines that are subversive of law and order? And why should not the Church act in a similar manner in regard to her own subjects? Again, as our government claims the right to inflict punishment when its legislation in this matter is disregarded, so also can the Church inflict appropriate punishment when her laws are set at naught. In fact, wherever lawful authority is admitted, there must also be admitted the power of coercion; the one without the other is futile, and practically non-existent. Hence to brand such punishments as exhibitions of unjustifiable intolerance is simply to subvert all lawful authority. Consequently, taking the term in that odious sense which the enemies of the Church have attached to it, civil intolerance has no place in the Catholic Church.

And what about dogmatic intolerance? Is the Catholic Church dogmatically intolerant? She certainly is, and always will be. The very fact that she is certain of possessing the truth in matters of religion, forces her to reject all other religions as false. In

her teaching and preaching she will not and cannot admit that there is any true religion on earth except the one which she received from the Divine Founder of Christianity. Truth is one, and if her religion is true, then others that are opposed to hers must be false. Now truth is necessarily intolerant of falsehood, and therefore the Church that professes to teach the true religion, must in her doctrinal teaching of necessity be intolerant of every other Church.

Our Protestant brethren take this attitude of the Catholic Church very much amiss; yet if they would but consider the matter dispassionately, they would soon come to the conclusion that in the very nature of things no other attitude is possible. Take any Christian Church you please, if she is logically consistent, she must be dogmatically intolerant. For either she is certain of the truth of her doctrines, or she is not: if she is not certain, she has no business to teach; because she knowingly runs the risk of leading her children into error: if she is certain, logical consistency requires that she brand all doctrines opposed to her own as false, and that is dogmatic intolerance.

Non-Catholic denominations boast nowadays of their toleration in doctrinal teaching: they say that they are broadminded enough to admit that other religious bodies may be in possession of the truth; yet what does this toleration and broadmindedness mean? It can only mean one thing, namely, that there is no certainty anywhere, and so it doesn't matter much what is taught or believed. Hence no other argument is needed to show the unsoundness of Protestant teaching than its boasted dogmatic toleration, its false broadmindedness in matters of revealed truth. If a person is certain that two and two make four, can he be broadminded enough to admit that his friend may be right when he holds that two and two make five? Such broadmindedness is possible only when he is not certain of his own position regarding the matter in question. The moment he admits that his friend may be right, he admits also that he himself may be wrong, and therefore he surrenders his claim to a certain possession of the truth. And as it is in mathematics, so is it in religion; truth is one wherever it is found and because of this oneness it must of its very nature be intolerant of falsehood.

It is sometimes said that this dogmatic intolerance, though logical enough in theory, leads to palpably absurd consequences when reduced to practice, and therefore it should not be accentuated. To this I answer that the absurd consequences to which dogmatic intolerance leads are the result of misunderstanding, or false inferences. Thus, for example, as the Catholic Church holds that hers is the only true religion, and as evidently a false religion can avail nothing for salvation, it would seem to follow that she must consign all other believers to the everlasting torments of hell. As it stands, the consequence is surely absurd enough, but then it is not contained in the premises. The Catholic Church holds most certainly that her religion is the only true one, and also that the true religion alone avails for salvation; but that is by no means the same as to say that every one who has not come to the knowledge of the true religion must be lost. It only means that non-Catholics are not saved by the religion which they profess, for that religion is false, and no one can be saved by a false religion; but they may be saved in spite of their religion, if they are in good faith and serve God

to the best of their knowledge. If they make diligent inquiry concerning the true religion, and then follow the light which God gives them, the Catholic Church does not call their salvation in question, even though they should never be sufficiently enlightened to enter the fold by a formal profession of her faith, because she holds that they belong to it in spirit. But if Protestants allow themselves to be led by prejudice; if in spite of their better judgment they are unwilling to examine into the claims of the true religion, and thus wilfully shut their eyes to the light of God's grace, who will blame the Catholic Church for holding that they are lost? They might as well blame Christ for saying: He who believeth not all things whatsoever I have commanded shall be condemned. The two positions are identical, and whoso approves the one, may not condemn the other. It is only in this sense that the Catholic Church understands that much abused proposition, "Out of the Church there is no Salvation."

Again, Protestants blame the Catholic Church for not allowing her members to visit non-Catholic places of worship, and more especially for doing all in her power to pre-

vent them from listening to Protestant sermons. But what absurdity is there in this prohibition, if Protestant forms of worship are unauthorized and if their sermons lead away from the truth? If the Church was established to lead men to heaven, it is plainly her duty to warn them against all dangers that beset the way. Were she to make no provision in this matter, we might apply to her those terrible words of St. Paul: "If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." This prohibition may at times have unpleasant consequences, but as these consequences flow necessarily from the certain possession of truth, they afford matter for joyous sacrifice rather than for regretful submission.

But you will say, why then does the Catholic Church invite Protestants to be present at her services? Why does she ask them to listen to her sermons and lectures? Is she not inconsistent in this? Does she not thereby lead Protestants into evil? For if it is wrong for Catholics to expose themselves to the risk of losing their faith, is it not equally wrong for Protestants? No, the Catholic Church is not

inconsistent; on the contrary, consistency requires that she should make every effort to lead Protestants to a knowledge of the truth. As she proves by incontrovertible arguments that she is a divinely appointed teacher, she holds from Christ the commission to "make disciples of all nations." Nor do Protestants violate any principle of their Church by attending Catholic services, and by listening to Catholic sermons; for no Protestant Church claims infallible teaching authority, and therefore no Protestant Church has power to interfere with its members in their search for truth as directed by their own private judgment. Hence individual Protestants have not only the right to seek after truth outside their own Church, but they are in conscience bound to do so, for their Church admits that she may be in error. Consequently, when the Catholic Church addresses herself to all, without distinction of creed, so far from leading Protestants astray, he rather helps them to fulfill a duty imposed upon them by their own conscience.

Hence I may well conclude these remarks on Toleration and Intolerance by stating, that the Catholic Church is intolerant only in so

far as she caries out the solemn injunction of her Divine Founder: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." If any there be who object to this intolerance, they must object to Christ Himself, and that they cannot do without ceasing to be Christians.

IV.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

Any Church that claims to teach with authority, and to point the way to heaven with certainty, must needs be dogmatically intolerant. For such a Church is either in conscious possession of the truth, or she is not; if she is not conscious of possessing the truth, she has no right to teach, because she knowingly runs the risk of leading men into error; if she is conscious of possessing the truth, she must be dogmatically intolerant, because truth is necessarily intolerant of falsehood. Hence the charge of dogmatic intolerance, so persistently urged against the Catholic Church, and against her alone, is a convincing proof that he is the sole representative of the one true religion which Christ established on earth.

Now this dogmatic intolerance is perhaps nowhere more strikingly manifested than in the

interpretation of the Bible. In regard to this the Catholic Church holds that she alone constitutes the final court of appeal, by whose decisions all her children must abide. This claim she bases upon the fact that Christ made her the custodian of revealed truth, and commissioned her to teach whatsoever He had commanded. And rightly so: for as the greater part of revealed truth is contained in the Bible, it is necessarily part of her office to decide what is, or what is not, the meaning of any given text. Nor can such a decision be subject to correction by anyone, no matter what be his learning and erudition. For if it were possible to appeal from her interpretation of the Scriptures, she would have to admit that she might err, and consequently she would have no authority to demand belief under pain of eternal loss: — an authority which Christ evidently conferred upon His Church when He said: "He that believeth not shall be condemned."

Against this uncompromising attitude of the Catholic Church, in regard to the Interpretation of the Bible, religious innovators of all ages have ever directed their fiercest attacks. And necessarily so. For whatever new re-

ligion a man may originate, if it is to be at all Christian in character, he must needs make appeal to the Bible; yet as long as any established Church claims to be the sole interpreter of Bible truths, such appeal is impossible. Hence in the very nature of things, this particular claim of the Catholic Church is violently assailed by all Protestant denominations, no matter how much at variance they may be among themselves as regards other points of doctrine. They one and all charge the Catholic Church with an assumption of authority that is wholly unwarranted, and that deprives the faithful of the spiritual food stored up for them in the pages of the Bible. Of course, the charge thus made has been refuted time and time again by Catholic controversialists, but this notwithstanding, it is urged with unabated vigor whenever the occasion presents itself. In view of this it would seem advisable to investigate the matter somewhat in detail, as we shall do in the present discussion.

To make our discussion intelligible, we must distinguish two points, the one involving a fact of history, and the other a question of doctrine. The historical fact of which there

is question, is suggested by the timeworn charge that in the past the Catholic Church withheld the Bible from the laity, or at least from such as were unable to read the Sacred Scriptures either in Latin or in Greek. I say in the past, because that the Church does not withhold the Bible from the people at present, is so evident that no one can make such a statement without convicting himself of bad faith. For not only is the Bible to-day found in every true Catholic home, but Catholics are exhorted by their pastors to read it frequently and devoutly. Nay, the late Pope Leo XIII, even granted an indulgence to "all Catholics who would spend fifteen minute a day in the devout reading of the Gospels of Jesus Christ." Hence in this first point we are concerned only with the past, namely, whether in past ages the laity were forbidden to read the Bible.

Time was when this charge was urged against the Catholic Church by all sorts of Protestants, but that time is fast slipping by. It still forms part of the stock-in-trade of professional slanderers, and also of some well-meaning men and women who simply go by hearsay; but fair-minded and well instructed

Protestants, whom experience has taught the necessity of seeking their information concerning the Catholic Church from reliable sources, know better than to make so unreasonable a charge. As a Protestant writer in the Church Quarterly Review puts it: "The notion that the people in the Middle Ages did not read the Bible is not simply a mistake; it is one of the most ludicrous and grotesque blunders." (1. c. Oct. 1879.) And so it is. It is true enough that before the art of printing was invented, copies of the Bible were somewhat rare; but that need not be a matter of surprise to anyone who is at all familiar with the conditions of the times. Suppose for a moment that all our printing establishments were destroyed, and could not be rebuilt; that the art of paper manufacture were suddenly lost, and that instead of printing thousands of pages within the space of a few hours, men had to form every letter by hand, so that it would take months and years to finish a single copy of the Bible; which, moreover, owing to the expensiveness of the material employed and the enormous amount of labor spent on its production, were to cost hundreds of dollars, do you think every

Protestant home would be furnished with a Bible? I am afraid you would hardly find a sufficient number to give one to each minister or preacher of the Word, and this, in all likelihood, would be secured to the pulpit by means of a heavy chain so that it might not be carried off by thieves. The wonder is not that there were so few Bibles in pre-Reformation times, but that there were so many. Men must have held the Bible in the highest esteem when they were willing to spend a small fortune in procuring the necessary writing material, and then laboriously copy the sacred text, letter by letter, page by page, and chapter by chapter, from Genesis to the Apocalypse. In fact, had it not been for the spirit of faith that made of this drudgery a work of love, the Scriptures might have utterly perished, as did thousands of other works of the distant past.

That this great difficulty of securing copies of the Bible was the true reason why the Sacred Scriptures were not more extensively read, is manifest from the fact that during the seventy years which intervened between the invention of printing and the Protestant Reformation, nearly two hundred editions of the Bible, either whole or in part, were published

in the various modern languages. For no other book was there so constant and so universal a demand; nor did the Church in the least interfere with the reading of the Scriptures, so long as no abuses crept in. Blessed Thomas More, who died a martyr's death under Henry the Eighth, tells us that "the whole Bible was long before Wyclif's days, by virtuous and well-learned men translated into the English tongue, and by good and goodly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read." (Dial. iii. 14.) And the learned John Eck, also a contemporary of the Reformation, testifies that the same practice obtained in Germany, adding that he himself had read nearly the whole Bible before he was ten years old. (Janssen: I. p. 54.) Nay, even Luther himself said: "In my youth I accustomed myself to read the Bible, and I read it often, and I became so familiar with the text that I knew where to find each single statement." (Table-talk: ed. 1568, fol. 16.) Yet in his youth Luther was a Catholic, and was bound by the same laws as any other Catholic young men. If we add to this the statement of Luther's fellow reformer, Melanchthon, that in his youth the Bible was

read much more extensively by the young than it was the practice after the Reformation (Lampert: Bible, p. 460), it must be evident to all that the Bible was anything but an "unknown book" in pre-Reformation times.

But, you will say, is it not an historical fact that the Church at times forbade the reading of the Bible in the vernacular? It is and it is not. The Church never issued a general prohibition that made the reading of the Bible in the vernacular unlawful; but at various times she laid down certain conditions regarding the matter, which had to be observed by the faithful, so that they might not wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction. It was not until the Albigenses, the Wyclifites, and later on the Protestants, issued editions of the Bible that bristled with mistranslations, and the most arbitrary changes of the original text, that the Church made stringent regulations in regard to the reading of the Scriptures. These regulations did not make Bible-reading unlawful, but required that only approved editions, well supplied with explanatory notes taken from the writings of the Early Fathers, should be used. For a short time it was furthermore required that

those who wished to read the Bible in the vernacular should obtain ecclesiastical permission, but this law was soon tacitly set aside, so that practically no other condition was to be observed than to secure a faithful and approved translation of the original text, which, for the guidance of the unlearned, was copiously annotated.

In this matter, as in so many others, Protestants fail to distinguish between the action of the Church and the actions of Provincial Synods. It is indeed true that the Synod of Toulouse, in 1229, the Synod of Tarragona, 1233, and the Synod of Oxford, in 1408, issued formal prohibitions against the reading of the Bible by the laity, but these prohibitions had only a local application, and were revoked as soon as the danger that threatened the faith in those localities had passed. Hence it remains perfectly true that the Church never withheld the Bible from the people. Her legislation in this matter was never prohibitive, but only tended to the enactment of such restrictions as the common good evidently required.

That this restrictive legislation was most reasonable, becomes quite manifest when we

call to mind that the religious innovators purposely mistranslated the Holy Scriptures, so as to enable them to defend their unorthodox views, and thus to lead simple-minded people into all sorts of religious errors. Bunsen, himself a Protestant, pointed out as many as three thousand faulty translations in Luther's version of the Bible. Nor were they merely literary variations, but many of them radically changed the meaning of the original text. As an example take Luther's translation of the twenty-eighth verse of the third chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The correct translation of this verse, as approved by all scholars of eminence, is the following: "For we account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law." The last clause of this sentence, namely, "the works of the law," refers to the law of Moses as is evident from the context, and as Luther himself admits; so that the meaning of the whole verse is: "We account a man to be justified by the Christian faith, without performing the works prescribed by the Mosaic law." But Luther wished to use these words of St. Paul to prove his theory that man is justified by faith to the exclusion of all good

works; hence in his translation he quietly slipped in the adjective "alone," and accordingly his version reads: "We account a man to be justified by faith alone, without the works of the law;" so that not only works perscribed by the Mosaic law, but good works of all kinds were excluded. When his friends expressed their surprise at this insertion, he wrote to them: "You seem to be surprised that I said, we are justified by faith alone, though the word 'alone' is not found in the Apostle's text. If your Papist cavils about this word, say to him at once, that Papist and ass are the same thing. The whole reason that I have to give for this addition is that I will to have the word 'alone' there. Thus will I, thus do I command; let my will stand by way of reason." (Audin, p. 112., note.)

Nor did he stop at slipping in words of his own, but whenever his preconceived theories required it, he would drop whole books, declaring on his sole authority that they were uncanonical, though in the past they had always formed part of the inspired writings. Thus he rejected the entire Epistle of St. James, calling it an epistle of straw, because in it St. James teaches that faith without works

is dead, and avails nothing for salvation. Is it a wonder that the Church should have taken effective measures in order to preserve her children from the baleful consequences of such arbitrary proceedings? Had she acted otherwise she would have been grievously delinquent in her duty as divinely appointed guardian of revealed truths, and to her would have been applicable the words of St. Paul: "If a man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."

Nor yet was it only a question of guarding against textual corruption, but the Protestant theory of private interpretation was beginning to bear the most deadly fruit and needed a powerful corrective. To this Luther himself bears witness in the following striking passage, recorded by De Wette: "This one," he says, "will not hear of baptism, that one denies the sacrament, another puts a world between this and the last day; some say this, some say that; there are about as many sects and creed as there are heads. No yokel is so rude but when he has dreams and fancies he thinks himself inspired by the Holy Ghost, and must be a prophet." (Vol. III. p. 61.)

Now suppose that the Catholic Church had taken no measures to counteract this destructive tendency, what would have been the inevitable result? Luther tells us quite plainly: "There would have been about as many sects and creeds as there were heads," and the Church of Christ would have been vanquished by the powers of hell. Hence the fact that the Church enacted restrictive laws with regard to the reading of the Bible, should afford matter for commendation rather than for blame; because these laws are a manifest proof both of her great reverence for the sacred writings, and of the solicitude with which he watches over the faith of her children.

The second point to be considered in connection with this matter is doctrinal in character, and regards the authority which the Catholic Church claims in respect to Scriptural interpretation. She allows all her children to read the Bible; she is well pleased when they devote their time and talents to the elucidation of the sacred text, or write learned treatises concerning the doctrines contained therein; but in all this she claims the right of supervision, so that whenever there is question of

interpretation, she herself is the final court of appeal. To this attitude of the Catholic Church, Protestants one and all take exception, contending that in the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures every one is his own Daniel. Men and women, learned and unlearned, young and old, are all supposed to be competent to learn the faith from a devout reading of the Bible, and if they should differ as to the meaning of any particular text, each and every one has an incontestable right to his or her own opinion. Hence the question presents itself, which of these two views is right, and which is wrong; for both can certainly not be right, since the one is the contradictory of the other.

That this question cannot be decided on *a priori* grounds is manifest; because the Founder of Christianity might have chosen either one of the two methods in transmitting the truths which He wished to be believed. As it was possible for Him to establish in His Church an infallible teaching authority to which all His followers should be obliged to submit, so also was it in His power to confer the gift of infallibility upon each single individual. However whilst He was not

obliged to choose one method rather than the other, one of the two He certainly chose; because He bound all under pain of eternal loss to believe all things whatsoever He commanded, and this He could not have done unless He had provided some means whereby men could know with absolute certainty what truths He commanded to be believed. Hence the question resolves itself into this: Did Christ make private judgment the final criterion of Scripture interpretation, or did He establish an infallible teaching authority by whose decision all His followers must abide?

If we turn to the Scriptures for an answer to this question, we certainly find no argument whatever that can be advanced in favor of private judgment. When speaking to the unbelieving Doctors of the Law, who would believe neither His words not His works, Christ told them indeed: "Search the Scriptures, for you think in them you have life everlasting; and the same are they that give testimony of me." (John v, 39), but in saying this He laid down no general principle which He intended for the guidance of His followers. As is evident from the context, He only used against His adversaries an

argument the force of which they themselves recognized; an argument which is identical with that which the Catholic Church uses against Protestants in this very matter, when she says: "Search the Scriptures, for you admit that they bear testimony to the truth, yet they testify that I am the divinely appointed teacher of Christ's revelations." That Christ intended private judgment as a final criterion of revealed truth, He not so much as indicated in all His teaching.

On the other hand, nothing could be plainer than Christ's oft repeated and clearly expressed intention to establish in His Church an infallible teaching authority, to which all His followers should yield an unqualified obedience in matters of faith. When He promised to found a Church against which the gates of hell should not prevail, He made Peter the rock upon which that Church should rest securely. (Matt. xvi, 18). To Peter He entrusted the office of feeding His lambs and His sheep; (John xxi, 15–18); Peter He confirmed in the faith so as to enable him to confirm his brethren also. (Luke xxii, 32). Again, when He commissioned His Apostles to preach the Gospel, He enjoined all to re-

ceive their teaching as His own infallible word; for He said: "He that believeth not shall be condemned;" (Mark xvi, 16), so that the refusal on the part of men to be guided by the teaching authority which He established, was to be the cause of their eternal damnation. Now, as Christ intended His Church for all times, so did He also intend the perpetuity of this teaching authority, as He clearly indicated when He said: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." (Matt. xxviii, 20). In conformity with this, He laid down the general rule: "If a man will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matt. xviii, 17). Hence if there is anything clearly expressed in the Bible, it is the fact that Christ established in His Church a teaching authority which was to be the final court of appeal in matters of faith, and therefore in the interpretation of the Scriptures.

This same point is still further proved by the historical fact that the Gospel was announced to the world, not by means of written documents, but by the living voice of Christ's ambassadors. Christ Himself certainly never wrote a line, nor did He enjoin upon His

Apostles to write books, but to preach with authority whatsoever He had commanded. If some of the Apostles and disciples, years after Christ's ascension, and therefore after the Church had already been established, made a synopsis of the Gospel message, it was rather by way of notes, that might indeed serve to help the memory, but were never intended to take the place of the living and infallible teaching authority ordained by Christ. Bible Christians, who built their faith upon the Sacred Scriptures as interpreted by themselves, were unknown in the early Church; they are an offspring of the Protestant Reformation. A modern writer puts this very strikingly when he says: "It is as futile to speak of Bible Christians in the days of primitive Christianity, when men died for Christ by the thousands, as to speak of the Emperor Nero or Decius travelling about in a Pullman palace car, their families going down the Appian Way in an automobile, their generals using smokeless powder, Maxim guns, or Mauser bullets, or their ministers reading telegraphic dispatches from all parts of the empire."

Now if Christ established an infallible teaching authority, it is quite certain that there

is no room for private judgment as a final criterion in the interpretation of the Bible. For as it is admitted by all believing Christians that the Bible is a storehouse of revealed truth, its interpretation must in the very nature of things belong to the divinely appointed guardian of these truths; because else we should have a final court of appeal without jurisdiction, which is an absurdity. The same is, moreover, quite evident from the very nature of the Sacred Writings. For although there are some truths in the Bible that are easily understood, yet there are many others of which human reason understands but little, unless they be made intelligible by the living voice of an infallible teacher. This Luther himself admitted when he said: "To know exhaustively one word of Holy Scripture, and to understand it thoroughly, is impossible, all learned men and theologians to the contrary notwithstanding; because they are the words of the Holy Spirit, and therefore too sublime for man to comprehend. . . . . I have at times tried to meditate on the ten commandments, and when I began with the first, which is thus worded: 'I am the Lord thy God,' I could not advance beyond the first

little word 'I'; and that 'I' I have not yet learned to understand." (Table-talk: ed. 1568, fol. 3). What St. Peter said of the Epistles of St. Paul, namely, that there are in them "certain things hard to be understood, which the unstable wrest to their own destruction," is applicable to many other parts of the Bible. Unless its interpretation be subject to the judgment of a living and divinely established authority, it becomes the source of all sorts of errors.

That this is not mere theory, but a matter of practical experience, must be evident to anyone who has had occasion to study the Babel of conflicting opinions that have resulted from the application of private judgment to the interpretation of the Bible. How many Protestants, do you think, agree even on its fundamental teachings? We have already heard what Luther said concerning this matter in his own day: "There are about as many sects and creeds as there are heads." And that matters have not improved since Luther's time, is evident from the fact that scarcely a year passes which does not witness the birth of a new sect, ushered into existence by a recently excogitated interpretation of

some Bible text. A Protestant writer put this very strikingly in an article recently published in the North German Correspondence. After stating that the Catholic Church possesses a sure, unchanging source of interpretation, which is lacking in Protestant Churches, he continues: "Not only do our theologians dispute, rightly or wrongly, this way and that way, over the genuineness and authenticity of certain books of the Bible, but with one stroke of the pen they blot out sometimes a chapter, sometimes a verse, even in passages whose authenticity they recognize.

"When one teacher has shown, 'as clearly as daylight,' that a passage should be taken in one sense, another appears and shows, also, 'as clearly as daylight,' that the interpreter is in error, and that the passage must be understood in a new sense. When theologians are themselves ignorant of the art of penetrating the sense of the Bible, how much are we poor laymen to be pitied. We are sent to the Bible, and nowhere in it do we find a means of understanding it, or of reaching a unity of faith from it. What kind of Church must this one be which is always appealing to

a book without being able to furnish any solid interpretation of its contents?"

In view of all this, it seems to me, I may well conclude this discussion with the famous words of St. Augustine: "I would not believe the Gospel unless moved thereto by the authority of the Church." (Contra Epis. Fund.)

V.

MARY'S PLACE IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

The fact that Christ established in His Church an infallible teaching authority, to which all His followers must yield an unhesitating obedience, makes it evident that there is no room for private judgment as a final criterion in the interpretation of the Bible. For the truths contained in the Bible belong to the sacred deposit of faith, and must therefore necessarily be safeguarded by the authority which Christ appointed to teach whatsoever He had commanded. Individual members of the Church may read the Bible; they may meditate on the truths contained therein; they may even suggest interpretations of obscure passages; but in all this they must be subject to the teaching of the Church as the final authority from whose decisions there is no appeal. Hence when Protestants protest against the authority which the Catholic

Church has always claimed in regard to the interpretation of the Bible, they protest against Christ Himself, for He said clearly and distinctly: Teach ye all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.

Now as the Church was made the final court of appeal in matters of faith, so was she also made the final court of appeal in regard to devotional practices; for devotional practices are but an outward manifestation of inward belief; they are, as it were, the blossoms and the fruit that grow upon the tree of faith. If the Church has authority to demand belief in the mysteries of religion, she must for the same reason have authority to determine in what manner these mysteries shall be honored by the faithful. Thus, for instance, when the Church teaches that Christ is really and personally present in the Holy Eucharist, she is in the very nature of things expected to decide what devotional practices shall, or shall not, cluster around the altar as their source and center. Hence authority in matters of faith must imply authority in matters

of devotion; the one is inseparably bound up with the other.

It is because of this divinely established authority, regulating the outward expression of faith, that the Catholic Church is, and has ever been, so fruitful a source of devotional practices. In fact, few things are more striking in the Catholic Church than the variety of approved devotions that cluster around her sacred altars. Devotions to God, devotions to the God-Man, devotions to the friends of God — His saints, who reign with Him in glory. From the birth of the Christ-child in want and suffering, to the triumphant entry of the risen Saviour into heaven; and from the coming of the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier, to the feast of all His sainted children, the Church crowds her days with the grateful memories of God's mercy and power. Aside from the special and festive commemoration of divine mysteries, she presents to us, on nearly every day of the year, some one of her many saints for our veneration and imitation. Now she points to a St. Aloysius all beautiful in the whiteness of his virginal purity; now to a St. Augustine seamed, indeed, with the wounds of his early sins, yet made bright and glorious

by the sweet austerity of chastening penance. Now it is the lovely innocence of a St. Agnes that enchains our attention: now the sweet patience of a St. Lawrence, or the trustful perseverance of a St. Monica. Every high ideal has there its concrete realization, and every human needs finds sympathy and aid.

Yet devotions to all these saints occupy but a secondary rank when compared to the devotion practiced in honor of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God. The triumphs of other saints we celebrate by dedicating one day to their memory; we honor them by having recourse to their aid in some special need: but such veneration falls far short of that which is considered due to her who is "our tainted nature's solitary boast." Every incident in her life is to the Church of the greatest interest, and as such it calls for a special commemoration. Her Immaculate Conception, her Nativity, her Presentation in the Temple, her glorious Assumption into Heaven, are so many sources of sweetest joy to all her faithful children. Nor yet did the Church think it sufficient to set apart single days for her special veneration, but she consecrated to her memory the year's most

beautiful month — the month of May — during which the whole Catholic world celebrates her praises and extols her queenly virtues.

From this it is evident that Mary occupies a very prominent place in the Catholic Church, and it is the reasonableness of this prominence that we shall consider somewhat in detail in the present discussion.

To the Catholic this devotion to Mary seems most appropriate; nay, without it, the religious world would appear deprived of one of its sweetest charms: but the matter is viewed in a very different light by our separated brethren. To them devotion to Mary is often the greatest stumbling-block in their way to the true faith. The time-worn calumny that Catholics adore the Virgin, is indeed fast losing its market value; but other objections, apparently not less formidable, are put in its place. These objections are many and various; yet they may all be reduced to the following two, which form the pith and marrow of Protestant difficulties concerning this matter. First of all, Protestants contend that Mary was but an ordinary woman, and that therefore Catholics

are unreasonable in assigning to her so prominent a place in their devotional practices: secondly, they maintain that devotion to Mary of its very nature detracts from the devotion that is due to Christ, and consequently it should not be tolerated in the Church whereof Christ is the founder. This is, I believe, a fair statement of the objections commonly urged against Catholics by modern Protestants; hence if we can dispose of these difficulties, we shall *ipso facto* vindicate Mary's right and title to the place which she has ever occupied in the Catholic Church.

In answer to the first difficulty, namely. that Mary was but an ordinary woman, I say that it implies a fundamental error. Such a statement cannot possibly be made except by men who have lost sight of the fact that Mary is the mother of God, and not merely the mother of Christ's human nature. With regard to this point modern Protestants, or at least the vast majority of them, go much beyond the originators of their respective systems. Luther and Calvin, for instance, never once questioned Mary's title to the dignity of divine motherhood; nay, Luther went even so far as to claim for her, in consequence of her

divine motherhood, freedom from all sin. (Postill: Walch, 1745.) But as there is an ever growing tendency in Protestant Churches to emphasize the human element in Christ, so is there a corresponding tendency to deprive Mary of her greatest dignity. Hence it need not be a matter of surprise to anyone that Protestants are unable to enter into the spirit of Catholic devotion to the Virgin Mother. For Mary's first title to our reverence and love is the fact that she is in the true sense of the word the Mother of God. Deprive her of this prerogative, and you make her an ordinary woman:— the most perfect and the most saintly, if you will, but for all that only an ordinary woman, little deserving the homage that is paid her in the Catholic Church. On the contrary, concede to her the dignity of divine motherhood, and she must needs become the object of a devotion that falls short only of being divine. For then her honor becomes the honor of her son, and indifference to her means indifference to Christ. If she is the Mother of God, then God Himself must demand that we honor her as such; for can He Who engraved the law of filial love and rev-

erence upon the hearts of all be indifferent to the honor of His own mother?

To grasp the force of this reasoning we must bear in mind that Mary, in virtue of her divine motherhood, is just as truly the mother of God as any human mother is the mother of her own child. For though there are two natures in Christ, the one divine, the other human; nevertheless there is only one person, and that person is divine — the person of God the Son. This person was born of the Virgin Mary, in virtue of the hypostatic or substantial union which was effected between it and the human nature at moment of conception. Hence when we say that Mary is the mother of God, we do not mean that she is merely the mother of Christ's human nature; for then she would be the mother of a man, not of God: neither, of course, do we mean that Christ owed His divine personality to Mary, in the sense that it received existence only at the moment of conception; for a divine person as such cannot owe his existence to a creature, nor can such a person begin to exist in time, but must necessarily be from all eternity; but what we do mean is, that the moment of Christ's conception in the womb of the Vir-

gin Mary was the beginning of that substantial union the result of which is the God-Man, at once divine in person yet possessing as His own a human nature. This union makes Mary really and truly the mother of God. For as in merely human procreation parents are not the authors of their children's souls, because these being spiritual are directly created by God, yet in virtue of the intimate union which exists between soul and body, they are really and truly parents, not merely of their children's bodies, but of their persons; so too is Mary, in virtue of the substantial union between Christ's human nature and His divine person, the mother, not only of His human nature, but of His divine person:— the mother of the God-Man, the mother of God.

Now that the dignity of divine motherhood, thus explained and understood, must necessarily procure for Mary the veneration of all those who acknowledge her son as their Lord and Master, is evident from the very nature of the case. For the child is in a manner the substantial image of its mother, and the mother has, as it were, a second existence in the child of her womb; so that the honor of the mother is the honor of her child, and the

disgrace of the mother is her child's disgrace. Hence even among men, no true son will ever acknowledge as his friends persons who slight his mother; for what is done to her, he considers as done to himself. And this is all the more true in proportion as the family likeness that exists between mother and child, not only in the physical but also in the moral order, is the more perfect: yet where was this likeness ever carried to greater perfection than between Mary and Jesus? For did not the Angel call her full of grace, that is, corresponding in every particular to the sublime idea which God Himself had conceived of her as the mother of His Only Begotten Son? Hence not only is Mary the mother of God, but, as far as that is possible, also a worthy mother; a mother whom the Holy One of Israel was and is proud to acknowledge before angels and men as His very own.

The statement, therefore, that Mary was but an ordinary woman, is as false in fact as it is mischievous in principle. Mary an ordinary woman! Why, the mere thought of it is preposterous. God Himself pointed to her as the woman par excellence, who would crush the serpent's head; prophets foretold her com-

ing as the mother of the world's Redeemer; the court of heaven sent her an embassy to solicit her co-operation in the mystery of the Incarnation; the Angel saluted her with the words: "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women;" Elizabeth, inspired by the Holy host, greeted her: "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?" Mary an ordinary woman! That can be said only by one who has lost sight of the meaning of the Incarnation:— by one who does not belong to the generations of God's people; for all generations shall call her blessed.

Hence this attitude of indifference towards Mary's dignity, so thoughtlessly maintained by the majority of Protestants, is so palpably erroneous that many of the more thoughtful, who still believe in Christ's divinity, have abandoned it. They begin to realize, as Catholics have realized from the very first, that if Mary is the mother of God, she must of necessity command our admiration and love and reverence. Then, so far from being an ordinary woman, she is in very truth "our

tainted nature's solitary boast." Then all generations must call her blessed, because He that is mighty hath done great things to her.

The first objection, therefore, which Protestants urge against Catholic devotion to Mary, is without foundation in fact; and so also is the second one, as we shall see presently. Devotion to Mary, say our Protestant brethren, even though it be reasonable in itself, detracts from the worship due to Christ, and therefore it should not be encouraged. Protestants never tire of repeating the words of St. Paul, addressed to his disciple Timothy: "There is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (I Tim. ii, 5.) Which words, they think, exclude every other mediatorship, and consequently indirectly at least condemn the veneration of the saints, and therefore also of the Virgin Mary. But they forget that the Apostle speaks of a mediator who is such in virtue of his own merits, and not of one whose excellence must ultimately be referred to some one else. For he immediately adds: "Who gave himself a redemption for all." In this restricted sense, it is true enough, there is only one mediator; but this truth is as strongly em-

phasized by Catholics as by Protestants. The Council of Trent explicitly states that there is only one mediator, Jesus Christ, but it contends that the invocation of the saints in no wise interferes with this mediatorship. (Sessio XXV.) Christ is the one mediator of justice, whereas the saints, and even the Blessed Mother of God, are but mediators of grace and prayer, and this only because of the bond of friendship that unites them so intimately with God through Christ. The one does not exclude the other, and hence we find that St. Paul, to whom Protestants appeal in this contention, himself points to the saints, and even to the faithful upon earth, as mediators between God and man. (Ephes. vi, 18; Rom. xv, 30.)

Consequently, the objection that devotion to Mary detracts from the worship due to Christ has no force whatever. It is based upon the supposition that the honor paid to Mary is the same in kind as that paid to her Divine Son; yet this supposition is absolutely false. The honor and homage we pay to Christ is absolute and divine; it is divine worship in the strict sense of the term: whereas the honor and homage we pay to Mary is always relative

and human; it is not worship strictly so called, but only veneration. Christ we adore as God; Mary we venerate as specially near and dear to God. Christ we worship on account of His own increate perfection; Mary we reverence because He that is mighty has done great things to her. It is first and last for the Son's sake that we honor the mother. Because she is dear to Him, therefore she is also dear to us; because we honor Him, therefore we also honor her. Hence devotion to Mary cannot detract from devotion to Christ; because they are different in kind, and the one is inseparably bound up with the other.

That this is not merely a theoretical view of the matter, but is perfectly true in practice, is evident from the historical fact that the Catholic Church, which has always cherished the greatest love for the Mother of Christ, has also at all times been the staunchest defender of Christ's divinity, and has honored that divinity as no other Church that claimed Him as its founder has ever done. Cardinal Newman, who had himself been a Protestant, said very pertinently: "If we look through Europe, we shall find, on the whole, that just those nations and countries have lost

their faith in the divinity of Christ who have given up devotion to His Mother, and that those, on the other hand, who had been foremost in her honor, have retained their orthodoxy." (Difficulties of Anglicans: vol. II. p. 92.) Hence even so rationalistic a writer as Mr. Lecky, in his book entitled, "Rationalism in Europe," found himself forced by undeniable facts to make this statement: "Seldom or never has there been an ideal which has exercised a more salutary influence than the mediæval conception of the Virgin." (p. 234.)

So untrue, therefore, is it that devotion to Mary interferes with devotion to her son, that it is even a most efficacious means of preserving the faith, which is the source of all true devotion. Hence we can easily understand why the Church of Christ has in all past ages so earnestly exhorted her children to love and venerate His Blessed Mother. Historically considered devotion to Mary is as old as the Church of Christ, and necessarily so; for Mary's Son is the founder of that Church, and Mary was that Son's most faithful disciple. She was the morning star that announced the day of redemption, and to her was assigned

from the very first a central position in the Church wherein the fruit of redemption was to be preserved, a position second only to that of her Divine Son. When the Apostles, according to their Master's behest, awaited in Jerusalem the coming of the Holy Spirit, Mary was in their midst, persevering with them in prayer; around her the members of the Infant Church gathered for consolation and strength, knowing full well that under her protection they would be safe from all dangers which might threaten their allegiance to her Son.

And thus, from the first ages of Christianity even until now, Mary's position in the Church has remained unchanged. As circumstances of time and place demanded it, new devotional practices have been introduced, and new feasts have been instituted; yet the principles underlying these various outward expressions of devotion to Mary have ever remained the same. There has been a development from within, but no addition from without; there has been growth, if you will, but no loss of identity. In fact, there is scarcely a single devotion practiced in Mary's honor, that has not for its object some one of the many splen-

did prerogatives enumerated in her beautiful litany; yet that litany is the heirloom of the first ages of Christianity. So also her feasts; in one form or another, they nearly all took their rise in remote antiquity. Even the feast of the Immaculate Conception, commemorating a prerogative the truth of which was proclaimed as an article of the faith only some fifty years ago, was celebrated in Eastern Churches as early as the sixth century. Moreover, practically all her feasts had their origin in the spontaneous devotion of the faithful; the head of the Church, as a general rule, only sanctioned or approved what had long been a pious practice. This spontaneous spread of devotion to Mary is, in fact, but a manifest fulfillment of her own prophesy: "From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed; because he that is mighty hath done great things to me." (Luke i, 48–49.)

In this connection it may not be amiss to say just a word in explanation of certain expressions sometimes made use of in popular prayers addressed to the Blessed Virgin. Thus in many of these prayers Mary is said to be our life, our hope, the mother of di-

vine grace, the only hope of Christians. Protestants not rarely affect to be scandalized at such expressions, and infer from them that Mary is in some way made to take the place of Christ. Now, it is very true, if these and many similar terms be taken literally, they are, to say the least, extravagant; nay, some of them are out and out heretical: but then no Catholic ever takes them literally. Any child that knows its Catechism is perfectly aware, for instance, that Mary is our only hope merely in the sense that, like a loving mother, she takes a special interest in our salvation, and in virtue of that interest she obtains for us many favors which we would otherwise not have received. These expressions are, one and all, simply the language of love; extravagant, it may be, in their literal meaning, but very appropriate in the sense in which they are used. A modern writer on the subject puts this very well when he says: "The expressions of an ardent lover to his sweetheart may not all be literally true, for warmth of feeling often begets exaggeration of language. But who would cavil thereat, and ask the lover always to speak in cold, matter of fact terms? Must there be no warmth in the

expression of our love of the saints of God?" Hence if but taken in the sense in which they are used, these expressions contain nothing whereat anyone need be scandalized.

Thus, then, is Mary's place in the Church of Christ, both in fact and in principle, one of special prominence. Such it has always been, and such it always will be. Nearly two thousand years have passed by since the Virgin Mother beheld in prophetic vision the love and veneration of peoples yet unborn, and all these ages are vocal with songs in her praise. As age after age rolled by, nation vied with nation in proclaiming her prerogatives and extolling her virtues. You may go to the ice-bound shores of the frozen North, or to the verdant plains of the glowing South; to the populous lands of the historic East, or to the rising nations of the youthful West; everywhere, at all times, in all languages, will you hear the salutation: Ave Maria! Hail Mary! Who among the children of men has ever been honored with such undying fame? There have been women of renown, adorned with the royal diadem, who were the idols of their people; yet they have sunk into the grave, and their very names have passed from the

memory of man. There have been kings and rulers, wise in council and mighty in deeds of valor; yet their kingdoms have crumbled into dust. and the remembrance of their wisdom and valor dwells no more upon earth. But one there has been, and one there is, whose glory shall not vanish, and whose name shall not be forgotten, as long as there is a God in heaven and a Church of Christ upon earth, and that one is Mary, the Mother of God.

VI.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND EDUCATION.

In the nineteenth chapter of his gospel, St. Matthew tells us how on a certain occasion the mothers of Israel brought their little ones to Our Lord, asking Him to "impose hands upon them and pray." The Apostles took this maternal solicitude much amiss. Their Master was evidently tired, for He had spent the day in healing the sick and instructing the multitudes that had followed Him beyond the Jordan. Hence they thought it would be pleasing to Him if they were to send these mothers away, and they did so without consulting Him on the matter. But He rebuked them, saying: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come to me: for the kingdom of heaven is for such." Then He received them kindly, laid His hands upon them, and finally sent them away with a great blessing.

In these few words the Evangelist has drawn a most touching picture, which has determined for all times the attitude of Christ's Church in regard to education. Our Lord's great love of these little ones, His solicitude for their eternal welfare, and the gladness of heart with which He imparted to them His blessing, stand out in a manner so striking that the Church, founded to carry on His divine mission upon earth, must needs consider the education of the young as one of her most essential duties. And this she has always done. Her history is the history of Christian education. God-appointed teacher of the nations, she has brought the light of knowledge and the warmth of virtue to countless people who sat in darkness and in the shadow of death. She has taken the little ones from their mothers' arms, touched their young minds with the magic wand of God's truth, opened their pure hearts to the sweetness of divine love, and then sent them forth with God's own blessing upon them, that they might work out in their lives the high ideal set before the world by the God-Man, the one perfect pattern of Christian perfection.

Now this statement, that the Church is in

principle and in fact the friend and promoter of education, has at various times been violently assailed by men not of her faith. And perhaps never were these attacks more frequent and persistent than in our own day, when education is considered a panacea for all the multitudinous ills that afflict the body social. We Catholics are told that our Church has neglected this sacred duty in the past, and that she fulfils it only grudgingly at present. Nay, some go even so far as to say that she is, and always has been, positively opposed to education, at least to the education of the masses; they say that in her relations to the common people she adheres to the proverb: "Ignorance is the mother of devotion." Hence, though she may favor and promote the education of her ministers, yet, if she had her own way, she would do nothing to dispel the darkness of ignorance that envelops the masses.

This certainly is a serious charge; — a charge that has been refuted a hundred times, but, like Banquo's ghost, it will not down. Perhaps little good will come of refuting it once more, but it is so very serious, and urged with such unabated persistency, that silence

on our part might be construed into acquiescence. Hence it would seem proper to examine the matter somewhat in detail as we shall do in the present discussion.

First, then, is it true that the Catholic Church has, in past ages, been remiss in the fulfilment of this most sacred of duties? That question, I believe, can be asked only by one who is wholly unfamiliar with the history of the past; or, what is worse, has acquired his information from prejudiced sources. For nothing stands out more prominently on the pages of history than the untiring efforts of the Church to diffuse the light of knowledge no less than to foster the spirit of piety. From the very first centuries of her existence up to the time of the Protestant Reformation, provincial synods and general councils urged upon bishops and pastors and secular authorities the duty of providing educational facilities for the young. (Mansi: Conc. Coll. 13, 998, n. XX, et passim.) That these decrees were not always carried into effect, is true enough; but that was not the fault of the Church. She was confronted by difficulties that necessarily rendered many of her endeavors abortive: yet the mere fact that

in spite of all obstacles thrown in her way she constantly renewed her efforts, shows how much she had the cause of education at heart. Even if she had utterly failed, her noble endeavor alone would have been sufficient cause for commendation.

And here it is well to bear in mind what were the circumstances of the times, and the condition of the people, when the Church began and carried on her educational struggle. Her critics seem to imagine that all was peace and tranquillity; that she had but to put up a red schoolhouse by the wayside, and forthwith the children of the forest would flock in to drink their fill at the fountains of wisdom. Yet what are the facts? Scarcely had the Church been allowed to come forth from the Catacombs, when from the East and Northeast savage hordes poured down in vast multitudes upon the fair provinces of the vast Roman Empire, "trampling down with iron hoof and armed heel the thousand year civilization of Rome, and the culture of Greece." They were men of the forest and plain, who knew no law but that of their own savage will, and recognized no right save that of brute force. Their passage was like an all-

devouring conflagration, strewing their onward march with ruins and the desolation of death. Huns and Vandals and Franks and Goths joined hands in a common cause, whose object was plunder and pillage such as the world had not seen in all the centuries that were past. They came to destroy and to slay, to conquer and to rule. Old races, long civilized and highly cultured, were swept from the face of the earth, and their places were taken by these men from the forest and the jungle, wild with lust and thirsty for power. It was a social cataclysm that entombed law and order in universal chaos; the sword supplanted the pen, and the light of knowledge was quenched in a sea of blood.

Such were the conditions under which the Church began, and for a long time carried on, her work of civilization. Will you blame her if progress was slow and halting, and if, in the beginning at least, her efforts were productive of but meagre results? Suppose that an avalanche of savage Indians were to swoop down upon this fair land of ours, destroying our cities and enslaving our people, how long do you think, would it take our splendid Public School system to lift these fierce tribes

from the depths of barbarism to our present height of civilization? Would it ever accomplish this Herculean task? Well, we have tried that system on these very tribes, under circumstances the most favorable, and what is the result? A vanishing race, ignorant and vicious and savage, destined to disappear before it can even by courtesy be called semi-civilized.

Hence even if the Church had failed in her undertaking, the blame would not have been hers. But she did not fail. She took these rude children of the forest, fierce and indomitable though they were, and made them kneel in humble adoration before the altar of the meek and lowly Christ. She sent forth her sons and daughters and bade them make disciples of all nations. And they did. They built churches and founded monasteries, and wherever a churchspire pointed heavenward, or peaceful cloisters echoed the sacred psalmody of consecrated men and women, there also was found a school wherein even the poorest might have an education for the asking. We are proud of our National Free Schools, and look upon them as something exclusively American, yet anyone at all familiar with the

history of Medieval Europe must be aware that popular free schools were founded and maintained by the Catholic Church more than a thousand years ago. Every parish priest was required to have a clerk whose duty it was to instruct children in secular branches of knowledge, whilst he himself had to give them their religious training. (Decretal. c. 3. X. 3, 1.) It is true, indeed, that the Church did not make the study of purely secular branches of knowledge obligatory on anyone, because the circumstances of the times did not favor such an obligation, but she always made provision for these studies and offered gratuitous instructions to all according to their needs.

The truth is that all through the so-called Dark Ages, whenever an interval of peace made it possible for the Church to exercise her civilizing influence, schools sprang up on all sides, not only in cities and towns, but even in small villages, where conditions were most unfavorable. (E. Michael: History of the German Empire During the Middle Ages; p. 388.) Anyone who reads the records of those times, as they are now being published by both Protestant and Catholic historians, will soon become convinced of the fact that

schools were maintained in nearly every community, and, what is more, they were most liberally provided for, so that even the poorest might secure an education in keeping with their state in life. Not only were there Monastic and Parish Schools, but also what we would now call Public Schools, established and cared for by the community, and taught by lay teachers. Hence when the fearful disturbances that accompanied the introduction of the new gospel had somewhat subsided, the reformers asked the secular authorities, not to *build new* schools, but to *rebuild* those that had been torn down and demolished by such religious fanatics as the Anabaptists, and even by Luther's own followers. (Janssen: I. p. 23, et passim.) It is still the fashion in certain quarters to speak of pre-Reformation times as having been wholly deprived of educational facilities, but that is simply the result of relying on the assertions of writers who cannot even by courtesy be called historians. The Protestant Maitland puts this very strikingly in the introduction to his admirable book entitled, "The Dark Ages." He says: "I have heard of a traveller at an inn, who wished to look out and see if it was day:

and who returned to bed with a very wrong judgment on the matter, owing to his being in the dark himself, whereby he was led to open the glass door of a cup-board, instead of a window; and I must say, that, in trusting to the representations of some popular writers, you will be doing much the same thing." (l. c. p. 4.)

Nor was it only in primary education that the Church interested herself, but she also opened colleges and universities wherever a sufficient number of pupils could be procured to fill their halls. Erasmus, a contemporary of the Reformation, and, in many respects, the most learned man of his age, stated in a letter to Vives that in Germany there could hardly be found a town in which there was not an institution of higher education, and that nearly all of them maintained at great cost professors of languages. (Opera: III. p. 689.) And yet, in educational matters, Germany was at the time far behind France and Italy. In fact, years before Luther was born, there were scattered over Europe as many as seventy universities with their associate colleges and preparatory schools. "These universities had each their own distinctive

character — Paris excelled in theology, Montpellier and Salerno in medicine, Pavia in the arts, Bologna, Bourges, and Orleans in jurisprudence;" whilst in the preparatory colleges special attention was paid to the study of the ancient classics, which were so highly esteemed by the older Humanists. And here it must be borne in mind that these universities and colleges were founded with the full approval, and, in many instances, with the active concurrence of the Pope, even such as gave little or no attention to theology. Hence they represent in concrete form the great value which the Church, even in those much maligned times, placed upon higher education. (Michael: I, p. 432 et seq.)

Nor yet must it be imagined that these universities were such only in name, with a mere handful of students, as is frequently the case in this our well-schooled America. When we look up the records of the past, we find, for instance, that the university of Bologna, in the thirteenth century, had some years an attendance of ten thousand scholars: the university of Paris, according to Luther's own statement, had at the beginning of the fifteenth century twenty thousand students, and a cen-

tury before it had as many as forty thousand; whilst Oxford, in Henry III.'s time, is said to have contained thirty thousand. (Luther: Table-talk; ed. 1568, fol. 427. Drane: Christian Schools and Scholars; II. p. 43. Janssen: I. p. 81.) Supposing, as is sometimes maintained, that these numbers as given are somewhat too high, yet, after making all necessary deductions, they remain still large enough to make even our greatest universities with their four and five thousand students look decidedly insignificant. And these institutions of learning continued to flourish until the so-called Reformation emptied their halls of scholars, even as it had emptied the churches of worshipers.

In this connection it may be of interest to note, that of the one hundred and forty-eight universities which are found in Europe today, one hundred and eighteen were founded by Catholics, though many of them are now in Protestant hands. In fact, all the more important seats of learning, such as Oxford, Cambridge, Leipsic, Heidelberg, are simply the heirloom of Catholic times, and were in defiance of all law and justice alienated from their rightful owners. (Cf. Young: Catholic

and Protestant Countries Compared; p. 331 et seq.) What strange stories history has to tell: — stories that make it clear as daylight that the Church, which is said to act on the principle that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," evinced at all times a practical interest in education that stands unrivaled even in this age of universal enlightenment.

Touching this point, Canon Farrar, himself a Protestant, put on record an appreciation of the Church's work that does credit both to his fairmindness and to his knowledge of history. In his lecture entitled, "Christianity and the Race," he says: "Consider what the Church did for education. Her ten thousand monasteries kept alive and transmitted that torch of learning which otherwise would have been extinguished long before. A religious education, incomparably superior to the mere athleticism of the noble's hall, was extended to the meanest serf who wished for it. This fact alone, by proclaiming the dignity of the individual, elevated the entire hopes and destinies of the race. The humanizing machinery of Schools and Universities, the civilizing propaganda of missionary zeal, were they not due to her? And more than this, her very

existence was a living education; it showed that the successive ages were not sporadic and accidental scenes, but were continuous and inherent acts in the one great drama. . . . Life became one broad, rejoicing river, whose tributaries, once severed, were now united, and whose majestic stream, without one break in its continuity, flowed on, under the common sunlight, from its source beneath the throne of God."

But, you will say, if all this be true, why then does the Church to-day take so determined a stand against secular education all the world over? I answer that the Church does not take a stand against secular education as such, but against an education that is secular to the exclusion and detriment of religion. In fact, the position of the Catholic Church in regard to this matter was made perfectly clear by St. John Chrysostom, the world-renowned scholar and saintly Patriarch of Constantinople. This is what he had to say about purely secular schools some fifteen hundred years ago: "If no one can give you a guarantee that your schoolmasters are such as can answer for the virtue of your children, you ought not to send them to these schools.

'Are we, then, to give up literature?' you will exclaim. I do not say that, but I do say that we must not kill souls. When the foundation of a building is sapped, we seek rather for architects to reconstruct the whole edifice than for artists to adorn the walls. In fact, the choice lies between two alternatives — a liberal education, which you may get by sending your children to the public schools, or the salvation of their souls which you secure by sending them to the schools of the monks. Which is to gain the day, science or the soul? If you can unite both advantages, do so by all means; but if not, choose the most precious."

To understand properly the attitude of the Catholic Church in regard to purely secular schools, we must bear in mind that she views education in the light of eternity. To her the present life is but a preparation for the life beyond the grave, and hence she assumes it as self-evident that education must be such as to develop the religious element of man's nature, for that alone can give him a title to heaven. She never loses sight of the fact that education is in a certain sense but a continuation of the creative act of God, and as God created human beings, not merely for

the enjoyment of this world, but for the endless joys of life eternal, so also must education be directed to the attainment of that same end. God gave the child an intellect, a will, a memory — so many faculties that stamp upon its very being His own image. These faculties, as given by God, are in a manner imperfect; they are capable of development, susceptible of greater perfection, and this work of perfecting and developing harmoniously the God-given faculties, always with a view of attaining more readily and perfectly the great end for which God called human beings into existence, she regards as the very essense of education. To her way of thinking, therefore, education must first and last tend to perfect the divine image engraven upon every soul by the creative hand of God; whatever falls short of this, she rejects as insufficient for the needs of the child.

Viewing the matter in this light, the Catholic Church, taught by an experience of nearly two thousand years, believes that a purely secular education is wholly inadequate. Nay, she is convinced that unless the sacramental influences of religion be daily brought to bear upon the hearts and minds of the young,

the religious and moral side of their nature remains undeveloped. By this she does not mean that the greater part of the time should be devoted to religious instruction, but rather that the young should be surrounded by a religious atmosphere, so that they may realize from the very first that religion must form an integral part of their lives. Religious instruction is indeed necessary, for a religion that is not known cannot be loved, and unless it be loved it exerts little influence for good; but with all this, religious instruction is but of secondary importance: what is most needed is religious training; the constant application of religious principles to the views and pursuits of life. As the perfecting of the intellect depends upon systematic exercises along intellectual lines, so also does the perfecting of the will depend upon similar exercises along religious lines. In the one case as in the other, proper training is an indispensable prerequisite to success.

Hence even if it were true, as is so often asserted, that our Public School education is not anti-religious, the Catholic Church would have sufficient reason to withdraw her children from its influence. The mere fact that

it is professedly unreligious must condemn it as wholly unsuited to the proper training of the young. But besides, is it true that our Public School education is not anti-religious? I think not. I have the greatest respect for Public School teachers. I believe that, as a body, they are well-meaning men and women, who subject themselves to the drudgery of the class-room, not merely for the money that is in it, but for the noble purpose of benefiting their fellow-men. But is it not a fact that, from a religious point of view, they are of all shades of belief and unbelief? There are Catholics among them, and believing Protestants; but there are also found in their ranks the most pronounced infidels, who believe neither in God nor in an hereafter. Perhaps you will say, that as religion is eliminated from the school, the religious views of the teacher can have no bearing upon the pupils. This is not so. If nothing were taught in these schools except reading and writing and arithmetic, it might be possible to avoid all contact with religion; but they teach and must teach such branches as history, literature, and the natural sciences, and in these the religious bias of the teacher will

manifest itself in spite of his best intention. As M. Gabriel Mauriere puts it: "The teacher who takes his or her profession seriously can never be content with the mechanical teaching of the 'three R's,' but will somehow blend with them the fourth, 'religion,' and while no text-books of dogma are in his or her hands, will so teach and live the ideal life that she or he will be a 'living epistle known and read of all.'"

Now this being the case, is there no anti-religious influence brought to bear upon the Catholic pupils? In the preceding discussions we have seen what false views the majority of Protestants take of the Catholic Church, in regard to such questions as intolerance, the reading of the Bible, and devotional practices; yet these views are frequently met with in the text-books which Public School teachers are supposed to follow. Do you think that the average Protestant or infidel teacher will correct such false statements, especially when they are in harmony with their own personal views? Moreover, it is all too often the case that teachers will go out of their way to cast a slur upon the Church, or upon religion generally. Several instances of this sort have

come to my personal notice. It is only a few weeks ago, when a Public School teacher of this city referred to the Bible as a book which some call holy, but which he himself considered to be filled with nonsense. Do you think that statements like this make no impression on young minds and hearts? If the Bible is filled with nonsense, then Christianity itself is nonsense; for it is built upon truths contained in the Bible. Hence, though it be theoretically true that our Public School education is not anti-religious, it is absolutely false when viewed in the concrete; yet it is in its concrete aspect that it exerts its influence upon our children. In view of this, the Catholic Church is perfectly justified in following the advice of St. John Chrysostom, quoted above: "If no one can give you a guarantee that your schoolmasters are such as can answer for the virtue of your children, you ought not to send them to these schools."

To this conclusion some may take exception on the score that if separate schools are maintained, the Church puts an extra burden upon her members. For in that case Catholics must not only help to support the Pub-

lic Schools of which they make no use, but they are also called upon to support their own, and that without any assistance from the State. This is true; but whose fault is it? By what right does the State demand that we support schools to which conscience forbids us to send our children? Does not our Constitution grant freedom of conscience to all? And where is freedom of conscience more directly exercised than in the matter of education? Hence it is not the Church that puts this extra burden upon Catholics, but the State; and it does so without any right and title. If, therefore, you must blame some one, put the blame where it belongs.

Again, some will say that by refusing to send our children to the Public Schools, we deprive them of educational advantages for which we do not compensate them in our own schools. This is false. Catholic school education, even in secular branches, is fully equal to that of our State institutions. Wherever our pupils, whether from Parochial Schools, or Academies, or Colleges, have had an opportunity to compete with those of corresponding institutions of the State, they have invariably shown to advantage. Listen,

for instance, to what Mr. James Clancy, a New York public school inspector of twenty years' experience, has to say anent this matter. His statement, published in the New York Sun, is as follows: "For more than twenty years I have been familiar with the public schools. As a school inspector, I have paid particular attention to methods and results. But until recently I had never set foot in a Catholic parochial school. When I did enter, it was with a feeling that it would be impossible to find anything to commend, educationally, from a layman's point of view. . . . Nothing is further from the truth than the assertion that the parochial schools teach only religion. . . . Do these parochial schools turn out better educated children than those from the public schools? Last summer, while seventy-five per cent. of the graduates of the parochial schools who presented themselves for examination for entrance into the Normal College were admitted (and many with honor), only twenty-five per cent. of the graduates of the public schools were successful. This summer the Catholic percentage was higher." Similar reports come from Chicago, Pittsburg, and other cities

where the matter has been publicly investigated.

And as in primary, so also in secondary and higher education, do Catholics more than hold their own. A recent writer on the subject puts this very pointedly when he says: "We have no means at our disposal to institute a comparison all along the line; but Catholics are the same the world over, and the recent Examination Results in Ireland, for example, show the exclusively Catholic University College of Dublin far and away beyond all the others. Similar success it noted in England, and the troubles in France emphasize the same truth. There is not a shadow of a doubt that the popularity of the Catholic schools determined their suppression and impelled the infidel government to seize the establishment and turn the teachers as beggars into the street." (Pardow: The Only True American School System; p. 11.) Touching this writer's reference to France, it may be of interest to know, that in Paris, during a period of thirty-one years, each year twenty leading scholars were selected, by State examination, from the Catholic and State schools of the same grade. Of these six hundred and

twenty so selected by State officials, five hundred and twenty-seven were pupils of Catholic schools, so that in thirty-one years Catholic pupils carried off the victory thirty-one times without a break. (Cf. Young: o. c. p. 255.) No wonder that the State found it necessary to expel the Catholic teachers.

Hence look at the matter from what viewpoint you choose, you are forced to admit, by the logic of facts, that in regard to education the position of the Catholic Church is unassailable. Persons unfamiliar with the history of the past, or maliciously misinterpreting present conditions, may accuse her of acting on the principle that "ignorance is the mother of devotion"; yet the fact remains that "she supplies the fire from which others light their torches."

51
8

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

B 000 010 673 2